



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.


About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08248708 7





—

ANCIENT ATHENS

•The ~~W~~ Co.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATION



THE ACROPOLIS FROM THE GARDEN OF THE ZAPPEION.
The Olympieum on the extreme left.

ANCIENT ATHENS

BY

ERNEST ARTHUR GARDNER

YATES PROFESSOR OF ARCHÆOLOGY IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON
FORMERLY DIRECTOR OF THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ATHENS
AUTHOR OF "A HANDBOOK OF GREEK SCULPTURE," ETC., ETC.

ILLUSTRATED



New York


THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1907


All rights reserved

56



COPYRIGHT, 1902,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped. Published November, 1902. Reprinted
October, 1907.



Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

PREFACE

Sunt quibus unum opus est intactæ Palladis urbem
Carminē perpetuo celebrare, et
Undique decerptam fronti præponere olivam.

THE author of a book on Ancient Athens must needs owe much to his predecessors, and these are so many that, in an attempt to make more particular acknowledgment, there is no little danger of omission. In stating a few of the sources from which I am conscious of having borrowed most, I have no wish to slight the more numerous authorities to which others, and possibly I myself, owe as great or perhaps a greater debt. But this difficulty can hardly be avoided without allowing a preface to grow into a bibliography.

Among earlier travellers, I have most frequently consulted Wheler, Stuart, Dodwell, and Leake. Among those whom it has been my privilege to hear as well as to read, I would especially mention Mr. F. C. Penrose, F.R.S., and Professor Dörpfeld. Of recent works on Athens, I have constantly referred to Curtius's *Stadtgeschichte von Athen* and Mr. J. G. Frazer's edition of Pausanias; Miss Harrison and Mrs. Verrall's *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens* has also been useful. The existence of these works and others, such as Wachsmuth's *Die Stadt Athen in Alterthum*, Hitzig and

Blümner's edition of Pausanias, Michaelis's *Der Parthenon*, and Jahn and Michaelis's *Pausania Descriptio Arcis Athenarum*, has made it permissible to summarise results rather than to enumerate details of evidence, and I must refer to them any readers who wish to follow up matters of controversy or obscurity at greater length than has here been practicable or desirable. Professor Milchhöfer's *Schriftquellen zur Topographie von Athen*, attached to Curtius's *Stadtgeschichte*, are particularly convenient, as exempting later writers from the necessity of constantly justifying their statements by references to classical authors.

In order to disencumber the book of controversial matter, such discussions have been relegated, as far as possible, to the notes at the end of some of the chapters. Apart from these, it has been my aim to give as clearly and directly as possible the impressions produced by the sites and buildings described, as viewed in the light of the references made to them by classical authors. Where so much is doubtful, no writer can expect all his conclusions to be undisputed; but I trust that the book will not be found to have misrepresented either the available evidence or the theories that have been based upon it. The more advanced school of topographers may probably accuse me of a conservative bias, which I frankly admit, in so far as it implies that, where the evidence appears to be evenly balanced, I prefer to follow an opinion that is familiar and that has commended itself to generations of scholars, rather than to adopt the newest and most brilliant hypothesis.

The photographic illustrations for this book are some of them made from plates taken expressly for the purpose by Mr. C. Demetriou of Athens. Others are selected from the galleries of Athenian photographers, especially the admirable series of Messrs. Rhomaïdes, whom I have to thank for their courteous permission to reproduce many of their finest plates. The photographs of sculpture in the British Museum are mostly from Messrs. Mansell's collection. I am also indebted for several photographs to amateur friends; among these I would mention my nephew, Mr. Arthur Gardner, especially for his telephotographic views of architectural details, Mr. Stephen Marshall, Mr. F. Fletcher, and Miss Shove. Mr. Hasluck kindly made for me the sketch-diagram of the Attic coast.

The maps and plans have been prepared under my direction by Messrs. Walker and Cockerell. The maps are based upon the survey in Curtius and Kaupert, *Karten von Attika*, a work to which I owe also a more general acknowledgment. I wish to thank Professor Dörpfeld for his generous permission to reproduce several of his plans. Leave to make use of some plates from Dr. Middleton's *Plans and Drawings of Athenian Buildings* has been given me by the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies and by Mrs. Middleton, who has also kindly allowed me to print Dr. Middleton's unpublished plan of the Parthenon.

I have received help in the reading of the proof-sheets from my brother, Professor Percy Gardner of Oxford, and from my sister, Miss Alice Gardner of Newnham

College, Cambridge, both of whom I have to thank for many useful suggestions.

The question of the spelling of Greek names is always difficult; even if a scientific system be adopted, it cannot be followed with rigid accuracy. My general rule has been to transliterate from the Greek to the Latin alphabet as an educated Roman would have done. But some exceptions, "Nike" for example, are almost inevitable for convenience; nor have I aimed at any complete consistency in the use of forms in *-os* and *-us*, *-on* and *-um*, a matter on which Roman usage itself varied. In spelling, custom and familiarity must be the paramount considerations; and I think a natural reaction is setting in among scholars against a too indiscriminate use of *k*, *ei*, *on*, etc., in forms that are often not only uncouth in appearance, but actually misleading in pronunciation.

Finally, I must ask the indulgence of the reader towards a book printed in America while I am myself in London, and under circumstances which have precluded as complete a revision as I could have wished both of the text and of the illustrations.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON,

October, 1902.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
SITUATION AND NATURAL FEATURES	1
<i>a.</i> THE WATER SUPPLY	16
<i>b.</i> BUILDING MATERIALS	29

CHAPTER II

THE WALLS OF THE ACROPOLIS AND THE TOWN	36
<i>a.</i> TWO NOTES ON THUCYDIDES II. 13. 6	68

CHAPTER III

THE ACROPOLIS BEFORE THE PERSIAN WARS	73
---	----

CHAPTER IV

THE TOWN BEFORE THE PERSIAN WARS	88
<i>a.</i> NOTE ON THUCYDIDES II. 15. 3, 4	141

CHAPTER V

EARLY ATTIC ART	152
---------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VI

THE ACROPOLIS IN THE FIFTH CENTURY	208
--	-----

CHAPTER VII

THE PARTHENON	257
-------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII

THE ERECHTHEUM AND THE TEMPLE OF VICTORY	353
--	-----

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IX

THE CITY IN THE FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURIES	PAGE 381
--	-------------

CHAPTER X

THE THESEUM, THE ASCLEPIEUM, AND THE THEATRE	410
--	-----

CHAPTER XI

THE CERAMICUS	455
-------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII

ATHENS IN HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN TIMES	479
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII

PAUSANIAS IN ATHENS	511
<i>a.</i> ON THE ROUTE OF PAUSANIAS	534
<i>b.</i> TOPOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY OF ROUTE OF PAUSANIAS	538

CHAPTER XIV

THE PIRÆUS	542
----------------------	-----


INDEX	565
-----------------	-----

LIST OF FULL-PAGE PLATES

The Acropolis, from the Garden of the Zappeion . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
	FACING PAGE
The Acropolis, from the Museum Hill	73
The Parthenon, from the East	220
The Parthenon, from the North-west	257
Erechtheum, from the West	360
Theseum and North Side of Acropolis	410
Theatre, from the East	434
The Olympieum, from the South-east	486

PLANS

The Dipylon Gate	62
Excavation West of Acropolis	108
The Parthenon	260
The Erechtheum	356
The Erechtheum — Section from East to West	358
Dionysiac Theatre	436
Scena of Theatre	444
Library of Hadrian	498
Galley-slips in Harbour of Munychia	554



ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
Athens, from the Sea	2
The Sea, from the Museum Hill	2
The Sea, from the Museum Hill	3
Olive Grove near Athens, at Kolokythos	5
Athens, from the Observatory Hill	6
Athens, from the Observatory Hill	7
The Acropolis, from Lycabettus	8
Pentelicus in Winter, from near Cynosarges	9
Diagram of Attic Coast as seen from the Sea	10
Tourkovouni and Lycabettus	11
Athens, from the South	12
Athens, from the South	13
The Acropolis and Salamis	15
Callirrhoe, and Ridge of Rock in the Bed of the Ilissus	20
Interior of the Cave in the Asclepieum	22
Steps leading to Clepsydra	24
Door of Clepsydra	25
Aqueduct built by Pisistratus	27
End of Roman Aqueduct	28
Naxian Quarry, with Unfinished Colossus	32
Ancient Quarry on Pentelicus	34
Wall and Tower at Tiryns	40
Wall at Mycenæ	41
Pelasgic Wall at the South-east of the Acropolis	43
Rocks, Cleft, and Steps cut in Rock, on North-west of Acropolis	46
Acropolis from Areopagus, showing Caves and Long Rocks	48
Wall South of Dipylon Gate	50
Marble Drums	52
The Acropolis, from the South, showing the Cimonian Wall	53
Bastion and Temple of Nike, from below	55
The Acropolis, from the West	60
The Dipylon Gate	62
The Sacred Gate	65
The Barathron	66
The Arch of Hadrian	67
A Rock-cut House	73

	PAGE
Koile, with Foundations of Houses and Steps	74
Koile, with Rock-cut Foundations	75
Foundation of Peristyle of Old Temple	79
Great Altar of Rock and View of North-east Corner of Parthenon	85
Lycabettus, from the Acropolis	91
Cave of Apollo	93
Cave of Pan	94
Pit of Sacrifice in Asclepium	97
Polygonal Walls of Cistern	99
The Pnyx, from the Areopagus	104
Bema and Rock-cut Wall of Pnyx	105
Excavations West of Acropolis	109
Early Precinct of Dionysus	111
The Olympieum and Stadium, from the Acropolis	117
Stadium (before Recent Restoration), and Modern Bridge over Ilissus	121
Site of Agora, from Acropolis	128
Site of Agora, from near Theseum	132
Site of Agora, from near Theseum	133
District of Limnæ	147
Dipylon Vase, with Funeral	156
Amphora from Hymettus	160
Early Prothesis Vase, with Tomb	172
Early Pediment — Heracles and Hydra	180
Part of Early Pediment — Heracles and Triton	180
Bull and Lions	182
Man carrying Calf	184
Female Draped Figure	196
Relief of the Nymphs or Horæ	200
Flat Decorative Bronze Relief of Athena	202
Bronze Statuette of Athena Promachos	202
Bronze Statuette of an Athlete	203
Head of a Young Man	206
Rough Terrace Wall and Staircase South of Parthenon	212
Athenian Coin	214
View from near Temple of Nike	217
Propylæa, from Nike Bastion, in Turkish Times	219
North End of West Front of Parthenon	221
The Propylæa, from South Wing	225
Propylæa, from the East	227
Propylæa, from the North-east	229
Propylæa: Side Aisle of Central Hall	232
Details of the Ionic Order (Priene)	233
Bastion and Temple of Nike, from the North	235
Erechtheum, from the South-east	237
Inscribed Basis of Statue of Athena Hygieia by Pyrrhus	245

ILLUSTRATIONS

XV

	PAGE
Athenian Coin	248
Early Seated Statue of Athena	251
Heading of a Treaty between Athens and Samos	254
Portrait of Pericles	255
The Parthenon in Turkish Times	261
Interior of Parthenon, looking East	268
North Side of Parthenon, showing Curve of Steps	272
Unfinished Drums of Columns	275
Joint of Fallen Drum, showing Various Working of Surface	277
Section of Part of Parthenon, Restored	280
South-west Corner of Parthenon, showing Metope S. I., <i>in situ</i>	285
Metope S. XXVIII.	286
Metope S. XXVII.	287
Metope S. VII.	289
Metope S. XXX.	290
Metope S. XXXI.	291
Carrey's Sketch of West Pediment	294
Carrey's Sketch of East Pediment	295
Cecrops and Daughter	302
Birth of Athena	306
Sketch Restoration of East Pediment	308
"Horæ" and Iris, from East Pediment	310
"Theseus," from East Pediment	316
Three Draped Female Figures, from North End of East Pediment	318
De Laborde Head, probably from Parthenon Pediment	320
Horse of Selene, from East Pediment	322
West Frieze of Parthenon	324
Knights, from North Frieze	325
North Frieze of Parthenon (Older men)	326
North Frieze of Parthenon (Men bearing vases)	327
North Frieze of Parthenon (Cows)	328
North Frieze of Parthenon (Sheep)	329
East Frieze of Parthenon (Maidens)	330
East Frieze of Parthenon (Group of gods)	332
East Frieze of Parthenon (Priest, priestess, and attendants, and group of gods)	333
West Frieze of Parthenon, <i>in situ</i>	336
South Frieze of Parthenon	339
Group of Three Gods	341
Athena Parthenos — Lenormant Statuette	345
Erechtheum, from the South-east	353
Part of North Portico of Erechtheum	366
Capital of Column, North Portico of Erechtheum	367
Base of Column, North Portico of Erechtheum	367
Band of Carving, from Top of Wall of Erechtheum	368

	PAGE
"Caryatids" of Erechtheum	369
Temple of Athena Nike, from the North-east	373
Slab of South Frieze of Temple of Nike	375
Slab from Balustrade of Temple of Nike	378
Slab from Balustrade of Temple of Nike	379
Cave above Theatre	404
Choragic Monument of Thrasyllus above Theatre in Turkish Times	405
Theseum, from the West, showing Frieze, <i>in situ</i>	413
Metope of Theseum	415
Metope of Theseum	416
Athenian Coin	438
Middle Block of Front Seats in the Theatre	440
Theatre and Olympieum, from Acropolis	442
Relief from Theatre	449
Relief from Theatre	451
Sculptured Frieze, supporting Later Stage in Theatre	453
Marble Lutrophoros and Lecythi on Relief	459
Monument of Hegeso	464
Tomb Relief	465
Monument of Dexileos	466
Tomb Relief (Family group—parting scene)	467
Tomb Relief (Old man, young athlete, and slave boy)	468
Tomb Relief (Young warrior seated on prow of ship)	469
Tomb Relief (Deceased as hero at a banquet)	471
Marble Lutrophoros with Relief	474
Stoa of Attalus	485
Capital of Column in Olympieum	487
Tower of the Winds	490
Gate of Roman Market	494
Monument of Philopappus	497
West End of Library of Hadrian	499
Odeum of Regilla	500
Roman Baths	504
Harbour of Phalerum and Phaleric Bay	543
General View of Piræus from Munychia	546
General View of Piræus from Munychia	547
Harbour of Phalerum (Fanari)	552

ANCIENT ATHENS

ANCIENT ATHENS

CHAPTER I

SITUATION AND NATURAL FEATURES

Ἐρεχθεΐδαι τὸ παλαιὸν ὄλβιοι,
καὶ θεῶν παῖδες μακάρων, ἱερὰς
χώρας ἀπορθήτου τ' ἀποφερβόμενοι
κλεινοτάταν σοφίαν, αἰεὶ διὰ λαμπροτάτου
βαίνοντες ἀβρῶς αἰθέρος, ἔνθα ποθ' ἀγνὰς
ἐννέα Πιερίδας Μούσας λέγουσι
ξανθὰν Ἀρμονίαν φυτεῦσαι·
τοῦ καλλινάου τ' ἀπὸ Κηφισοῦ ῥοὰς
τὰν Κύπριν κλῆζουσιν ἀφυσσαμέναν
χώρας καταπνεῦσαι μετρίας ἀνέμων
ἡδυπνόους αὔρας· αἰεὶ δ' ἐπιβαλλομένην
χαίταισιν εὐώδη ῥοδέων πλόκον ἀνθέων
τῇ σοφίᾳ παρέδρους πέμπειν ἔρωτας,
παντοίας ἀρετὰς ξυνέρχους.

— Eur. *Med.* 824–845.

It is always instructive to trace the influence of geographical conditions upon the history of a people and upon its national character; this influence is peculiarly strong in the case of the Greeks, who were keenly sensitive to their surroundings, whether natural or artificial. It was not only the material conduct of life, in politics and in commerce, that was thus affected, but the æsthetic propriety of artistic and literary forms, or even of national aims and ambitions.



ATHENS FROM THE SEA.

New Phalerum in front; Tourkovouni and Pentelicus behind.

The clear air and temperate climate of Athens are constantly dwelt on by Attic writers as influencing the



THE SEA FROM THE MUSEUM HILL.

On the coast is the Phaleric Bay; Piræus to the right, Ægina above, to the left.

character of her people. This clear and luminous air may still be appreciated by a visitor to Athens. Not only the sea with the nearer islands of Salamis and Ægina, but also the more distant coast of Argolis, are constant features in the landscape, while even Cyl-lene and Erymanthus and Parnon, eighty to a hundred miles away in the heart of the Peloponnese, are frequently visible. Yet there is none of the hardness of outline which often accompanies extreme clearness; everything is seen through a kind of luminous haze which often makes the distances difficult to realise. Perhaps the temperate climate of Athens is not always so obvious to modern travellers, especially when a cold



THE SEA FROM THE MUSEUM HILL.
Salamis beyond.

north wind is sweeping down from Thrace in winter or early spring, or when a June sun is reflected from the white marble walls and pavements. It is, indeed, probable enough that the climate has suffered a good deal from the denudation of the soil, and, above all, from the destruction of the forests in comparatively modern times. But in spring and autumn, and even sometimes in winter, the climate of Athens resembles in many ways that of an English summer at its best; while even in the hottest time of year the Athenians of to-day claim that the heat is never unbearable, thanks to the sea breeze that regularly springs up about ten in the morning.

Those who have not realised the exact position of Athens on the map are sometimes surprised, when first they go there, to find the sun setting over a western sea. Yet this is a fact which probably had some influence, not only over the light and colouring of the Athenian landscape, but also on the history of the people. For, while the whole Ægean was readily accessible to the navies and the commerce of the Athenians, the sea that lay beneath their eyes was an inlet into the Greek mainland. The diversity of sea and land, as seen in the view over the Saronic Gulf from Athens, is not only beautiful in itself, but also full of invitation to sailors who, like the Greeks, shunned the open sea. To them a maritime empire and an island or peninsular empire were synonymous; and here its conditions were most happily combined.

At first, however, it was the more immediate and material necessities of life that had most influence. The geographical position of Athens combined most of the requirements that were essential to the security and prosperity of a Greek city. We find that these



OLIVE GROVE NEAR ATHENS, AT KOLOKYTHOU.
Acropolis in middle distance.

requirements are provided for, in a greater or a less degree, in the case of most of the principal towns of Greece. We may roughly classify them under three heads: provision of food, protection from enemies, and means of commerce.

The question of food supply in early times practically resolves itself into pasturage and agriculture, though in the great days of Athens, as in modern England, it was mainly a question of commerce and control of the sea. Pasturage for flocks of sheep, goats, and pigs was to be found in the low-growing plants and shrubs that cover the Greek mountains, and so was practically ubiquitous

in Greece. Cattle can never have been reared in any great quantity in the grassless plains of Attica, and must then, as now, have been imported. Corn will grow in the Athenian plain, though the soil is light and the crop is usually a thin one; elsewhere in Attica the soil is



ATHENS FROM THE OBSERVATORY HILL.

Theseum and Lycabettus; above, Tourkovouni and Pentelicus.

better adapted to it, especially in the Rharian plain near Eleusis, where, according to the religious tradition, the gift of Demeter was first planted upon the earth by Triptolemus. The vine grows freely round Athens, usually in dwarf bushes to escape the force of the wind;

the wine of Attica was not famous in antiquity, but it probably was produced abundantly, as in modern times, for the use of the inhabitants. But, above all, the produce of the Athenian plain is the olive, the gift of Athena to her chosen city. The course of the Cephissus, from



ATHENS FROM THE OBSERVATORY HILL.
Areopagus and Acropolis; above, Hymettus.

its source right down to the sea, is marked by a broad belt of olive groves, which have probably occupied the same ground in continuous succession since the first scions of the sacred tree of Athena were planted there. With such resources available, it was inevitable that the

Athenian plain should come to be occupied by a city. Indeed, one is even inclined at first to dispute the correctness of Thucydides, when he gives the lightness of the Attic soil as the reason why the country had escaped foreign occupation, and its autochthonous inhabitants had remained undisturbed from the earliest times. But he doubtless had in his mind an implied comparison with the rich plains of Laconia and Messenia, or even of Argos or Bœotia; and it is true that the product of these districts is more varied, partly owing to the greater fertility of the soil, partly to the superior and more continuous supply of water. The agricultural resources of Attica, if not tempting to a conqueror, were at least adequate to meet the needs of the inhabitants.



THE ACROPOLIS, FROM LYCABETTUS.

From the point of view of defence, the situation of Athens is similar to that of Argos, Megara, Corinth, and others of the chief towns of Greece. It is grouped around the defensible citadel of the Acropolis, which according to Thucydides formed, with its immediate surroundings, the whole town in early times. This rock

is situated in the midst of the plain; though not so commanding in height as the Acrocorinth or the Larissa of Argos, it is far more convenient and accessible. It is four or five miles from the sea, and thus safe from any sudden descent of enemies or pirates; the sea is so clearly visible from many parts of the town that, in case of any hostile approach, there was time enough to



PENTELICUS IN WINTER, FROM NEAR CYNOSARGES.

warn the inhabitants of the plain to take refuge in the citadel. An attack by land was almost equally well guarded against. The mountains that surround the plain are nowhere so near the city that an enemy could suddenly pour over them without giving any warning of his approach. On the south-east is the long ridge of Hymettus, on the north-east Pentelicus; between the two is a low pass that leads to Marathon, and that is the natural route for an invader who has landed upon the east coast of Attica; there is another route between Hymettus and the sea, but it is not one that a stranger




DIAGRAM OF ATTIC COAST AS SEEN FROM THE SEA.

would be likely to take. To the north-west the Athenian plain is separated from the Eleusinian by the low but rocky ridge of Ægaleos. There is a low pass, which is crossed by a fortification wall of uncertain date, between this and Parnes on the north; and it is intersected in the midst by the pass of Daphne, along which runs the Sacred Way to Eleusis. These were the usual routes of any army attacking Athens from the mainland, as in the Peloponnesian War; and they seem never to have been regarded as defensible, probably because they could all be turned by light-armed troops crossing the ridge, which, though steep, is nowhere inaccessible; but the distance from Athens of either pass is so great that they offered no risk of surprise. Between Parnes and Pentelicus there is a tract of broken ground, which affords the most direct route to Marathon, and by which the Athenians returned in their forced march after the battle; but this would hardly be chosen by any who did not know the country; another route through the same gap leads beneath Decelea and past the frontier fortress of Ænoë to the north-eastern portion of Bœotia.

The Athenian plain itself is divided in the midst by a range of hills which ends, toward

Athens, in the peak of Lycabettus; the ancient name of this range is not certainly known; it is now called Tourkovouni (the Hill of the Turks), for what reason I do not know. Lycabettus is now, and must always have been, the most conspicuous object in the immediate surroundings of Athens; the scanty references to it in ancient literature are always a puzzle to those who have seen it. Between it and the sea are a series of lower hills,—first the Acropolis, with its satellite the



TOURKOVOUNI AND LYCABETTUS. PENTELICUS BEHIND.

In front, the Areopagus is just visible on the left, the Acropolis on the right.

Areopagus, and further still the range that extends from the hill now crowned by the Observatory on the north to the Museum with the monument of Philopappus on the south, the Pnyx lying in the midst between them. The similar geological formation of all these hills, which consists of a mass of limestone above and of sandstone below, probably suggested to Plato¹ the most remarkable piece of geological theorising of ancient

¹ *Critias*, 112, A.

times, in which he anticipates much of the modern view of subaërial denudation, and also makes several statements as to the climate of Athens which are as true to-day as when he wrote them. The original city, he says, stretched from Lycabettus to the Pnyx, and from the Ilissus to the Eridanus; and it is evident from his description that he regards the whole of this



ATHENS FROM THE SOUTH.
Museum Hill and Acropolis.

area as a plateau, originally level, of which the hills that are now to be seen are the only surviving portions. The rest, he says, has been washed away by floods; and his view is the same as that of modern geologists, except that they would probably regard the process as a slower one than he imagined. He also notices that a similar process has been going on throughout Attica, that the hills now showing are like a skeleton, from which its flesh—that is, the soil—has been washed away. In former days, he says, there

was much more wood, and the ground consequently held and stored the water better, instead of allowing it to run away at once into the sea as soon as a shower had fallen. All these remarks are just what might be, and indeed have been, made by a man with an eye for country when he visits Athens now; but it is interesting to find that the same process was going



ATHENS FROM THE SOUTH.
Olympieum and Lycabettus.

on in the fourth century B.C., and even that it had already achieved many of the same results.

However interesting Plato's suggestions may be as a piece of geological speculation, they affect a period too remote to have any relation to historical geography. When the earliest settlers whom we can trace established their abode there, the various hills of Athens must have been just about as they are now. The use that was made of them for purposes of fortification we shall see later; it is enough to observe for

the present that the Acropolis must always have been the most suitable as a citadel, and that the other hills, though useful as outworks, did not in any way menace its security.

The plain and the citadel being thus available for food supply and for defence, it remains to consider the third requirement of an ancient city—in this case, perhaps, the most important of all. The mountainous nature of Greece and the immense length of its coast line, which allows no place on the mainland to be more than two or three days' journey from the sea, imply of necessity that maritime carriage was the most important. Even in these days of roads and railways, the coasting trade still represents a considerable proportion of the commerce even on the mainland; and the traffic with the islands is hardly less in extent. In ancient times the proportion of sea-borne to overland commerce was probably even higher, and Athens, at its convenient distance from the sea, and with its excellent harbours, had every opportunity for acquiring it. There were many commercial rivals in early times, and Miletus and Chalcis, Ægina and Corinth, bade fair even to surpass Athens. The commanding position which she obtained was doubtless due in the first place to the enterprise and versatility of her inhabitants, but partly also to her geographical position, which gave her a footing on the mainland as well as an excellent base from which to control the sea. It is probably this advantage of a continental over a purely insular position that



THE ACROPOLIS AND SALAMIS.
From south slope of Lycabettus.

enabled Athens to surpass some of her ancient rivals, just as it is enabling the Piræus at the present day to outstrip the rival port of Syra. On the other hand, Attica is not a highway of traffic like the Isthmus; by lying, as it were, in a backwater from the main streams of commerce, Athens escaped the commercial temptations of Corinth, which brought with them an enervation and luxury that were fatal to political and even literary vigour and independence. The distance of Athens from the sea was sufficient, as we have seen, for security from attacks; but it was not great enough to cause any inconvenience. The description of the various harbours of Athens must be reserved for the chapter on the Piræus. Here it suffices for us to notice that they offered every natural advantage

demanding by the changing conditions of earlier and later times, in the open, sandy bay of Phalerum, admirably adapted for the beaching of ships, and in the three closed harbours of the Piraic promontory, which offered complete protection both from storms and from hostile attacks.

With all these natural advantages, we need not so much wonder at the commanding position of Athens among the cities of Greece, as at the fact that she did not assume her destined rôle until a comparatively advanced period in the history of Greek civilisation.

I a. The Water Supply

Athens is but ill supplied with water naturally, and the provision of a sufficient supply for the growing town must always have been a difficult matter for its rulers. The two chief streams of the Athenian plain are, as is well known, the Ilissus and the Cephissus. But the Cephissus, though it irrigates the olive groves that were among the chief agricultural resources of Athens, nowhere approaches within a mile of the town; and the Ilissus, though it passes much nearer, has but a scanty and intermittent stream, and is liable to contamination in its upper course. A third stream, the Eridanus, is taken by Plato as bounding the original plateau of the town of Athens on the opposite side from the Ilissus, and these two are also mentioned by Pausanias as the two rivers of Athens. Older topog-

raphers, by an unaccountable error, place the Eridanus on the left bank of the Ilissus. There can be no doubt that Professor Dörpfeld is right in identifying it with the stream which rose upon the slope of Lycabettus, passed through the region occupied by the modern town, and in part also by the ancient, and flowed out through the narrow gap in the city wall to the south of the Dipylon Gate. In later times this stream, like the Fleet Ditch of London, was practically the main drain of the town; it was covered over for most of its course, and an arch and sluice gates belonging to it may still be seen near the Dipylon. The only difficulty in identifying it with the Eridanus lies in Pausanias' statement that the Eridanus was a tributary of the Ilissus, while this stream apparently runs in the direction of the Cephissus; but on Curtius' map of prehistoric Athens¹ it takes a turn to the south after leaving the town, and so joins the Ilissus just before that stream itself runs into the Cephissus. The ground enclosed by the Eridanus and Ilissus thus fits in admirably with Plato's theory as to the boundaries of the original plateau. In early times the water of the Eridanus may have been serviceable as it ran through the fields where the town was later built. Strabo says its springs could still be seen outside the Gate of Diochares, near the Lyceum, but to later writers it seemed ludicrous to think of drinking its water, which was not fit even for cattle.

¹ *Stadigesch.* II.

In the absence of satisfactory rivers, springs were of the utmost importance. There were several of these in Athens; when Pausanias expressly says that there was only one, he probably means only one that gave an adequate supply of drinking water. This is the famous Enneacrunus, which was, as he says, so called, "the Fountain of Nine Spouts," because of the manner in which it had been decorated by Pisistratus. Otherwise, he says, the Athenians depended on the wells that were scattered all about the city. So far his testimony is probably to be accepted, and is in accordance with what we learn from other sources, though there are extremely grave difficulties in the way of reconciling the position he appears to indicate for this spring with the evidence of other writers.¹ The other chief authority as to this spring is Thucydides. In his account of the early city of Athens, he says that it comprised only the Acropolis and the district immediately to the south of it.² After quoting the position of various early shrines in support of this view, he mentions also "the fountain now, from the work of the Tyrants, called Enneacrunus ["the Nine Spouts"], but formerly, when its springs were in the open, named Callirrhoe ["the Fair-flowing"]. This spring, being near, they made use of for the most important purposes; and it is still customary, from old habit, to use the water for the bath before marriage and for other sacred purposes." This statement meets with striking confirmation from

¹ See Note XVI *a*.

² See Note IV *a*.

early Attic vases, on which maidens are seen bringing water from a fountain that gushes from spouts fashioned as lions' mouths, and actually labelled *Καλλιρρόη κρήνη*. Thucydides also shows a true archæological judgment in citing this custom of the marriage bath as evidence. We know from other writers also that the custom was in high esteem; the water was brought in vases of a special form that were made for the purpose; and these vases, or their representations in marble, were set up over the tomb of those that died unmarried — a symbol that their bridal was with Hades. The rite of the marriage bath of Athens is analogous to a similar usage that we meet in many other places — the performance of a special act of devotion by a youth on attaining manhood, and by a maiden at her marriage, to the river-god, whose special function it was to foster the children of the state; one need only quote the lock that Achilles kept for Sperchius, and Orestes for Inachus, and the bath in the Scamander that was taken by the maidens of Ilium before their marriage. Such a solemn rite must clearly belong to the stream or spring regarded as the chief source of the life and fertility of the region; and so it is evident that Callirrhoe or Enneacrunus must have enjoyed such special honour in Athens. The epithet *γαμοστόλος*, applied by Nonnus¹ to the Ilissus, at once suggests that this river was associated with Callirrhoe in the ritual. Thucydides makes no exact statement as

¹ *Dion.* 39. 190. In this passage there is an immediate reference to the tale of Boreas and Orithyia, but the epithet is probably a traditional one.

to the position of the spring, which has been disputed, mainly from the difficulty of reconciling the description of Enneacrunus by Pausanias with other indications; but, Pausanias apart,¹ there is overwhelming evidence that Callirrhoe lay in the bed of the Ilissus. Thus, in the *Axiochus*² of Plato, Socrates, when by the Ilissus,



CALLIRRHOE, AND RIDGE OF ROCK IN THE BED OF THE ILISSUS.

sees Clinias running toward Callirrhoe; Herodotus says that when the maidens of Athens went to fetch water from Enneacrunus, the Pelasgians, who lived under Hy-mettus (*i.e.* just on the other bank of the Ilissus), did violence to them; Tarantinus,³ a writer of uncertain

¹ See Note XIII a.

² If the *Axiochus* is not by Plato, this does not matter for the present purpose; it is in any case a fourth-century document.

³ *Apud Hieroclem, Hippiatr.*, præf.

date, speaks of the Athenians building the temple of the Olympian Zeus close to Enneacrunus, and the *Etymologicum Magnum* states that the fountain Enneacrunus, formerly Callirrhoe, was beside the Ilissus. In addition to all this direct evidence there is also a passage in the comic poet Cratinus, "Lord Apollo, what a flow of words; his mouth is a twelve-spout fountain; Ilissus is in his throat," which doubtless alludes to Enneacrunus, and connects its springs with the Ilissus. We learn also from more than one authority that the spring Enneacrunus was noted for the coolness of its water. In accordance with all this testimony, it is practically certain that we must recognise Callirrhoe in the spring which may be seen trickling from the ridge of rock that crosses the Ilissus just below the Olympieum. Spon and Wheler attest that this spring was still known by the name of Callirrhoe at the time of their visit to Athens in 1676; its flow is now exceedingly scanty, but in Wheler's time it appears to have been more abundant; variations in the position and supply of springs are of course to be expected, especially in a district that is liable to earthquakes.

There would be no dispute as to the position of Enneacrunus if it were not for the testimony of Pausanias, which implies that the spring was close to the Agora, and is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile with its situation near the Ilissus. Under these circumstances there are only two alternatives: to accept with Loeschke, Dörpfeld, and others, the evidence of Pausanias as

correct and to reject or explain away all the other evidence that is at variance with it; or to accept, with Leake and the majority of other topographers, the evidence that has been given above as conclusive, and to explain the testimony of Pausanias as an error, either on his part or on that of his interpreters.¹ Either



INTERIOR OF THE CAVE IN THE ASCLEPIEUM.

Behind the curved slabs is the sacred spring.

course is open to very grave objections; and if the second is here adopted, it is with the fullest sense of its difficulty, a difficulty discussed in the note to the chapter on Pausanias. Nothing would justify so improbable an assumption but the necessity of a still more improbable assumption in the alternative case; and the opinion of

¹ Mr. Frazer's summary of this controversy is admirably impartial and convincing.

those who prefer to follow Pausanias, and to identify as Enneacrunus the aqueduct described below, must be admitted to have much in its favour.

Though Callirrhoe was the only spring that gave a copious stream of good water, there were several other springs in Athens. Three at least of these were on the Acropolis or its immediate neighbourhood; all of them had more or less brackish water, and consequently we find a tradition that all three of them had a mysterious connection with the sea. The most famous was the salt spring or sea (*θάλασσα*), below the Erechtheum, produced by Posidon as his symbol in his contest with Athena for the land of Attica. Pausanias relates that when there was a wind, the waves of the sea at Phalerum could be clearly heard at this spring, which he calls a well (*φρέαρ*). The second was the spring in the Asclepieum, which was of ancient sanctity, and was probably recognised as possessing medicinal qualities; the third is the Clepsydra, which lies just outside the main entrance to the Acropolis, on the north. It was reported of both these two springs that articles thrown into them reappeared in the sea at Phalerum. The Clepsydra was of more practical use than the others, and was included within the outworks of the Pelasgicon; it was once more included within the defences of the Acropolis by the bastion built by Odysseus Androutsos during the war of independence, and recently demolished. The steps that led down to it may still be seen below the north wing of the Propylæa. The

of good water. In any case it was probably too far out to count as one of the city springs; and, with the one exception of Callirrhoe, these probably all corresponded to the description of Vitruvius, who says the water from them had an iridescent scum on its surface, and that consequently they were not used for drinking, but only for washing and similar purposes.

When the natural supply was so unsatisfactory, artificial measures were evidently necessary as soon as the town began to increase in size. These could be of three kinds — wells, cisterns, and aque-



DOOR OF CLEPSYDRA.

ducts; and we find that all three were employed, both separately and in combination. The numerous wells of Athens are mentioned by several ancient writers; and a considerable number have been found in excavations on the site of the ancient city, especially in those of Professor Dörpfeld between the Pnyx, Areopagus, and Acropolis. On the top of the Acropolis large

cisterns were constructed for the storage of rain-water; one especially, to the north of the Propylæa, is still well preserved; it is built of squared blocks of Piraic limestone and coated with stucco, and probably belongs to the sixth century B.C. Professor Dörpfeld's excavations have discovered, cut in the rocks of the Pnyx hill, where it faces the Acropolis, a whole series of wells, cisterns, and channels intended to gather together all the water that could be obtained. But neither wells nor storage sufficed; and one of the chief results of Professor Dörpfeld's excavations near the Pnyx has been the discovery of a great aqueduct bringing a plentiful supply of water from high up the valley of the Ilissus. Some traces of this aqueduct had before been found beneath the Palace Garden and the Theatre of Dionysus. It emerges from the rock near the place where the carriage road to the Acropolis leaves the modern boulevard; and is led thence, in a built channel, to a large cistern constructed just at the foot of the Pnyx hill, opposite the entrance of the Acropolis. Some tile channels for the water have been found and are of sixth-century pottery; and some scanty fragments of a fountain built for the outflow of the water are of Kará stone—a material indicating the same period. There can be little doubt that this aqueduct, which must have provided the chief water supply of all this part of the town, was built by Pisistratus; it is exactly analogous to the aqueducts made by his friends and fellow-tyrants, Theagenes of Megara and Polycrates

of Samos ; and it affords an excellent example of the way in which those rulers courted popularity by providing for the needs of the citizens. In Roman times the great cistern was filled up, and the water was conducted farther along, by a channel that can still be seen beside the modern road, to a point opposite the end of the Areopagus. Professor Dörpfeld, whose avowed object before making these excavations was to find the site of Enneacrunus, naturally regards this aqueduct and fountain as the work of the tyrants referred to by Thucydides and Pausanias. The difficulty in the way



AQUEDUCT BUILT BY PISISTRATUS.

of this opinion lies in the passages already quoted, which imply that Callirrhoe was in the bed of the Ilissus. Professor Dörpfeld himself has to assume the existence of two fountains named Callirrhoe, one of which, that near the Pnyx, was afterward called Enneacrunus. Even this assumption does not, however, satisfy all the conditions ; the question is an extremely difficult one, and we shall have to recur to it in considering Pau-

sanias. But, in the passage of Thucydides already quoted, the description of Callirrhoe "with its springs in the open" certainly does not suit the system of wells, channels, and cisterns, mostly subterranean, that have been already described as existing in the face of the Pnyx hill; and it would moreover be inaccurate to say that this spring was "now, from the work of the tyrants, called Enneacrunus." What the tyrants did was to supersede the spring by an aqueduct — a quite different thing.

Another aqueduct, bringing water along the southern slope of Lycabettus from near Cephissia, was con-



END OF ROMAN AQUEDUCT.

From Stuart's *Antiquities of Athens*.

structed in Roman times; it ended in a cistern on the south-west extremity of Lycabettus. Both aqueduct and cistern are in the same positions as the modern water supply of Athens. In Stuart's time

the columns and architrave of a front to the cistern house were still standing, and their memory is preserved in the name of this region of the modern town, τὸ Κολωνάκι. On the architrave was an inscription, stating that the aqueduct was begun by Hadrian and completed by Antoninus Pius.

I b. Building Materials used in Ancient Athens

The materials used for building in ancient Athens were stone and marble, wood, and unbaked brick. As the two latter have in almost every case disappeared, the former alone concern us in a study of the extant remains. Baked brick was, of course, used also in Roman times; but there are no very considerable or characteristic buildings of this material left in Athens, and those who wish to study its use can find what they require in the preface to Middleton's *Rome*. The chief kinds of stone used in Athens were the following:—

(1) The Acropolis rock, a hard, bluish gray limestone, which forms the upper part, not only of the Acropolis, but also of Lycabettus and most of the other hills of Athens. It was the most accessible for all purposes, and we find that it was used for most of the earliest buildings, such as the Pelasgic wall and the early temple of Athena. This rock is still quarried on Lycabettus and elsewhere, and most of the houses of modern Athens are built of it. It is gen-

erally, in ancient as in modern times, used in rough, irregular blocks, for it is not at all easy to square and smooth.

(2) A soft sandstone which forms the lower stratum of the hills of Athens. It is a poor material, and was only used in early times for inferior work, often mixed with Acropolis rock; for instance, in the earliest orchestra circle of the Dionysiac Theatre.

(3) Piraic limestone, the material described in official documents as ἀκτίτης λίθος, from Akte, the farther portion of the Piraic promontory; it is still extensively quarried. It was used in immense quantities in ancient times, *e.g.* for the foundations of all the chief buildings of the fifth century, including the Parthenon and the Propylæa, for the Cimonian wall of the Acropolis, the Dionysiac Theatre, and the Odeum of Herodes Atticus. It was also used for the architectural sculpture adorning all the early temples on the Acropolis. This is the material commonly known, especially in German works, as "poros"; the word is perhaps better avoided, as it has come to be used very vaguely, and the statements of Pliny and Theophrastus as to poros (πόρος?) are misleading, for they describe it as a kind of marble; on the other hand, the πώρινος λίθος, mentioned both by ancient writers and in inscriptions, is certainly like this Piraic stone. It is also described by modern writers as tufa, calcareous tufa, or travertine—the latter a local Roman name.

(4) Kará limestone, so called from a village at the foot of Hymettus, where it was quarried. This material, so far as is known, was used only in the sixth century, and so often affords valuable evidence as to date. It is harder and lighter in colour than the Piraic stone, and often has a pinkish tinge; another peculiarity is the presence of cylindrical holes, due to marine shells. This may be seen in the foundation of the peristyle of the early temple of Athena, in the early temple of Dionysus by the Theatre, and elsewhere. It is usually called travertine by Middleton.

(5) Conglomerate (pudding stone) or breccia, made up of water-worn pebbles cemented together by a calcareous deposit. This is found on several of the hills near Athens. It was freely used for foundations and concealed portions of buildings of the fourth century and later, but not much before this time. The earliest dated example is the foundation of the later temple of Dionysus by the Theatre, which contained the colossal statue by Alcamenes, probably dedicated about 420 B.C. It is also used for the inner part of the great retaining walls of the Theatre, which, though not completed till the time of Lycurgus (about 330 B.C.), may have been begun a good deal earlier, perhaps in the fifth century.

All these varieties of rough stone, where they showed, were usually coated with stucco.

The different kinds of marble used in Athenian buildings are almost exclusively white or bluish. Coloured marbles, such as are commonly used in Rome, are prac-

tically unknown in Greece until Roman times, and although a few fragments of them may be seen lying about, they formed no part of any of the chief buildings now extant. These also may be found, by those who wish to study them, in the Introduction to Middleton's *Rome*. The chief marbles used in Athenian buildings are the following:—

(1) Island marble from Paros and Naxos. This was used almost exclusively in early times before the quarries



NAXIAN QUARRY, WITH UNFINISHED COLOSSUS.

of Pentelicus were worked. It is a white marble of high transparency, formed of coarse crystals varying in size; the finest quality comes from Paros, and was always, in later as in earlier times, regarded as the best marble for sculpture. The Naxian is of coarser grain and inferior texture; but there are also quarries of coarser marble in Paros, and of finer in Naxos, so that it is not always easy to distinguish the two. Both were used in early times for sculpture as well as for

architecture; even in buildings mostly constructed of limestone, the cornices and roof tiles were often of marble; it was especially suitable, from its semitransparency, for the roof of a building without windows. Both materials may most easily be seen in the female statues on the Acropolis Museum; most are Parian, but some Naxian—the one, for example, who holds a fruit to her breast. The great majority of the marble fragments of early date lying about on the Acropolis are of island marble. The Parian quarries have been worked in modern times, but are now deserted.

(2) Hymettus marble, which was quarried earlier than Pentelic, varies in colour from white to blue; that most used in ancient times was white with blue veins. It is harder and less transparent than Pentelic, but of finer grain than Parian. A good early example of its use is the statue of a man bearing a calf in the Acropolis Museum. In the fifth century it was not much used, but in the fourth century and later its variety of colour was appreciated, and it was used especially for dados in stoæ, as in the stoa behind the stage of the Theatre, and often in later times it was used for pavements in alternation with the white Pentelic. It is still quarried, and is extensively used in modern Athens.

(3) Pentelic marble, which, next to Parian, is the best white marble known. It is of smaller and finer crystals than Parian, and cuts easily owing to its even texture, which almost resembles that of lump sugar; it is fairly transparent, though less so than Parian; and

it contains a certain amount of iron, to which is due the beautiful golden tinge which it takes from weathering. The fact that Mount Pentelicus or Brilessus was made almost entirely of this marble appears not to have



ANCIENT QUARRY ON PENTELICUS.

been discovered until the fifth century, and it is only after the Persian wars that Pentelic marble becomes the usual material for all the chief buildings; the Parthenon, the Erechtheum, the Propylæa, and most of the other monuments of Athenian architecture are made of

it. The best specimens of this marble are pure white, though blue veins are visible even in some of the blocks of the Parthenon.

The quarries are still worked, and the chief buildings of modern Athens also are of Pentelic marble, but a perfectly white block is now hard to find; almost all have blue veins in them, and some are as blue as Hymettian. It is said that Herodes Atticus used up all that was left of the finest quality in seating the Panathenaic stadium. The modern quarries may be seen as a white scar on the slope of Pentelicus, to the left of the summit as viewed from Athens. The ancient quarries are to the right. A new quarry, which has recently been opened, is said to have an abundance of pure white marble.

These are the chief white marbles used in Athens; isolated fragments of other kinds may be found, but there was no need to import from abroad, with so excellent and abundant a supply close at hand. To these may be added

(4) Black Eleusinian stone, which, though not of crystalline texture and so not, properly speaking, marble, was used in conjunction with marble in the finest Athenian buildings. It is similar in texture to the Acropolis rock, but is black instead of blue in colour. It is used most effectively for a dado and for other decorative lines in the Propylæa, and also as the background to which marble figures in low relief were attached, in the frieze of the Erechtheum.

CHAPTER II


THE WALLS OF THE ACROPOLIS AND THE TOWN

WE can distinguish three main periods in the history of ancient Athens as a walled city: first, there is the time when the Acropolis was the city, and there were no fortifications except on the hill or its immediate outworks; then comes the brief but most interesting period when the town was provided with a wall and the Acropolis probably dismantled as a fortress, but when Athens still remained isolated in the midst of the Attic plain; and after that the bold and magnificent design that connected the town with its seaports by the Long Walls, and so produced a city impregnable and unassailable so long as she remained mistress of the sea. Considerable remains are left of these various fortifications; and, partly by their help, partly by a study of the natural features and their adaptability to defence or attack, it is possible still to form a fair notion of the boundaries of the town they enclosed.

We must not form our conception of the rocky plateau of the Acropolis itself from the clearly outlined and symmetrical shape that is familiar to us from maps and plans, or even from our knowledge of Athens as it now



PELASGIAN WALL, WITH MARBLE FACING BELOW.
Parthenon behind.



is. The history of those straight and massive walls does not yet concern us, except in so far as it makes us realise that they are artificial in plan, and do not follow the natural contours of the hill. The rock is, however, naturally precipitous on all sides except the west. The south side must always have been practically inaccessible ; but there are some difficult approaches on the north that were in part utilised for posterns. At either side, east and west, there was a shallow depression in the middle, facilitating a possible access. The oldest works of fortification are still standing in some places. The story goes that the early Athenians employed the Pelasgians to fortify the Acropolis for them with those gigantic walls, of which some remains are still to be seen. In size and character these walls are similar to the fortifications of Tiryns and of Mycenæ. In the case of both these towns also the building of the walls is attributed to a foreign people ; the foreigners, however, are not the Pelasgians, but the Cyclopes, a race of mythical giants from Lycia. The divergence of tradition is a curious one ; for the primitive walls of all three cities are associated with fragments of pottery and other remains which all testify to a similar civilisation and handicraft. Under these circumstances the attribution of the building of the walls to a foreign people in each case, but to different foreigners, seems to imply nothing more than that the matter was a mystery to the later inhabitants, and is of no more historical value than the attribution of somewhat similar megalithic monuments to giants or to the devil with

which we are familiar in northern Europe. Of course the whole question of the Pelasgians in early Greece cannot be dismissed so lightly; but the tradition of their building the walls of the Acropolis is precisely analogous to the similar tradition about the Cyclopes from Lycia at Mycenæ and Tiryns; and that tradition has not as yet



WALL AND TOWER AT TIRYNS.

received any confirmation from archæological evidence, though it would be rash, in view of the unexpected and startling discoveries of recent years, to deny that such evidence may possibly be discovered by future investigation. We shall come across the Pelasgians again at Athens, and especially in relation to the Pelasgicon, or Pelargicon, which was probably a kind of outwork at



WALL AT MYCENÆ.

the west end of the Acropolis. But, in relation to the great fortification wall that crowned the craggy summit of the Acropolis, this name gives us little help.

The fortification, as has been said, follows the natural contours of the rock much more closely than the later wall; and its chief purpose was evidently defence. Its course may be followed on the plan; it survives on the south, east, and west sides in fragments that suffice to indicate its whole run. On the north side its position is more conjectural, chiefly because the later wall in this part follows the natural contours more closely, and therefore conceals its predecessors. The shallow depression in the rock at the east end is cut off by a massive wall,


built right across it, of which the lower courses still survive. Indeed, the early fortress must practically have presented the appearance of a large tower at each corner. The main entrance, as in later times, was at the west end, and was flanked, as is usual in early Greek fortresses, by a projecting bastion on its left, to which the right or shieldless side of an attacking enemy must be exposed. In addition to the main entrance, there was a postern approached by a long internal staircase, toward the eastern portion of the north side, in a position analogous to the posterns of Mycenæ and Tiryns. There is also another very curious means of access, concealed in a natural cave, which is of great interest in later times; but there is nothing to show whether it was taken into account in the earliest fortifications.

At the west end, in front of the main entrance, was a kind of terraced outwork called the Pelasgicon, or Pelargicon; it was also known as the Enneapylon, or enclosure of the Nine Gates. How these gates were placed there is no definite evidence; but the most probable conjecture is that they were set one within another in a series of bastions or terraces; a strong confirmation of this view is to be found in the Frankish and Turkish fortifications of this same slope, which have now been entirely demolished. These fortifications certainly did not follow the lines of the primitive ones, of which all trace had disappeared and all tradition was lost; but they were dictated by similar conditions; and old plans of the Acropolis show that in Turkish times the ap-

proach led gradually up to gate within gate, just as it must have done in the old Pelasgic outwork. Why it was called the Pelasgicon or Pelargicon is a very obscure question.

The name may be due to the same tradition that attributed the walls of the Acropolis to the Pelasgians. But the other form, *Pelargicon*, which is perhaps the better attested of the two, is hard to explain. Possibly Aristophanes, in his jesting connection of the word with *πέλαργος*, a stork, came nearer to the truth than he imagined. The

place is not, indeed, in itself a likely one for storks to frequent; certainly none are to be seen there now. But several tribes of early Athens took their name from



birds or beasts—one need only remember the *Αἰγυίς* and *Λεοντίς*—and such a tribe may have lived in this region. It is even possible that this may be the origin of the story about the Pelasgic walls; but it must be admitted that the whole question is one of the greatest doubt and obscurity, and that any such conjectures as this are not to be admitted in serious argument. The outwork probably extended originally some little way along the north side, and rather farther along the south side, as well as at the west end; for a similar extent must be assigned to the sacred precinct that in later times occupied its place and inherited its name.

We do not know how long the walls of the Acropolis remained the only fortification of Athens; but as the city grew, and the centre of civic life was transferred from the palace of the king to the agora in the town, it must have been desirable to protect the houses of the body of the citizens, and not merely to provide them with a refuge to which they could escape in case of attack. Such a change must in all probability have taken place at least as early as the reforms of Solon; one would naturally expect it to be contemporaneous with the abolition of the kings. The Acropolis still remained as a citadel, and its occupation was naturally the first step taken by any one aiming at tyranny; the ill-fated attempt of Cylon and the successful stroke of Pisistratus both serve as examples. The first positive evidence which we have as to the existence of a town wall is the narrative given by Thucydides¹ of the assassi-

¹ VI. 57.

nation of Hipparchus by Harmodius and Aristogiton; and he evidently had taken a good deal of trouble to ascertain all the details of this event correctly, since he observes that the current versions were far removed from truth. He says that on the day of the Panathenaic procession Hippias was superintending the arrangements "outside in the Ceramicus"; and that Harmodius and Aristogiton, seeing one of their confederates speaking to him, and believing their plot to be betrayed, "rushed at once within the gate, and fell on Hipparchus beside the Leocorion." The proximity of the Leocorion shows that the gate in question must have been the one corresponding to the later Dipylon; and the narrative implies not only that there was already a town wall for the gate to be in, but also that its line cannot, at this point, have been very different from that of the later circuit.

When Hippias was driven out of Athens by the Alcmaeonidæ with the help of the Lacedæmonians, the Spartan king occupied the Acropolis until he was expelled by Clisthenes. It was doubtless on this occasion that the Acropolis was dismantled as a fortress; for its danger to the security of the citizens, whether from a domestic tyrant or a foreign foe, had been amply demonstrated by recent events; and when the Persians invaded Attica, twenty years later, it is evident that the Acropolis was not in a defensible state without the erection of temporary barricades.

That the lower town was surrounded by a wall at

the time of the Persian wars is sufficiently proved by its description in the Delphic response as *τροχοειδής*, wheel-shaped. Such a description could never have applied to the Acropolis, nor would it suit an unwallled town. It may perhaps be objected that it is difficult to



ROCKS, CLEFT, AND STEPS CUT IN ROCK, ON NORTH-
WEST OF ACROPOLIS.

see why, in that case, the Athenians never thought of defending their city; but the danger of such a course was manifest. Without the Long Walls, Athens was untenable against a prolonged and systematic investment, such as the vast hordes of the Persians could easily maintain.

Supplies would be entirely cut off, and there would have been no hope of relief unless the Persian army was defeated—an event of which there was not the slightest hope, without the Athenians themselves to join in attacking it. It is little wonder therefore that, when the Delphic oracle bade the Athenians trust to a wooden wall, the majority of the citizens transported

their wives and children across the sea, and themselves manned the ships that were to save Greece in the battle of Salamis; a few, mostly old men, interpreted the response more literally, and remained on the Acropolis, barricading the entrance with a wooden wall. This passage proves that without such a barricade the Acropolis was indefensible. The defenders held their own against assaults until the Persians found their way up by a precipitous and unguarded approach through the precinct of Agraulos.¹ It has generally been supposed that the escalading party either climbed up in the open, where they could hardly have escaped notice, or else ascended by the direct but narrow staircase that may still be seen above the grotto of Agraulos; but so obvious a way, if not strongly barricaded, could hardly have been left unguarded. Recent excavations have shown a much more likely route. A natural cleft in the rock runs under or within the northern wall of the Acropolis; its western entrance is in the projecting face of rock just to the west of the cave of Agraulos; it has also an outlet at the eastern end, nearly opposite the west end of the Erechtheum. Where this cleft is within the wall of the Acropolis, it has an opening at the

¹ Herodotus' description of this way up as in front of the Acropolis but behind the gates has caused some confusion. Leake, for example (*Top. Ath.* p. 128), thinks it implies that Herodotus regarded the north side as the front, and quotes modern instances of the same view, while others thought front must mean east, to which the temples face. The entrance to the subterranean passage faces west, the same direction as the main entrance, and is about seventy yards to the rear of it; thus Herodotus' description is both accurate and obvious.

top which gives access to the plateau above it; but there is a sheer drop of about twenty feet, which might well lead the defenders to regard it as needing no guard; and an attacking party, once within the cleft, could ascend at their leisure with scaling ladders or ropes. A mediæval staircase goes part of the way down, but now ends abruptly, and must be descended with caution; it is easy to pass right through the cleft from below.



ACROPOLIS FROM AREOPAGUS, SHOWING CAVES AND LONG ROCKS.

The defenders of the wooden wall, thus taken in the rear, could make no further defence, and the Persians set about a systematic destruction of the temples, houses, and walls of Athens. We have no exact record of the extent or the manner in which they dismantled the fortifications of either town or Acropolis; but something can be inferred from what Thucydides tells us of the proceedings of the Athenians as soon as they returned to the ruins of their city. His statements refer mainly, if not exclusively, to the walls of the town, and this fact

alone is significant; in a democratic state the town walls were essential for defence, the existence of a fortified citadel was unimportant and even undesirable. In one passage¹ we read that "only a small portion of the circuit was still standing"; in another² we have a most interesting account of the rebuilding: "In this way the Athenians built the wall of their town within a short time; and the building still shows clear evidence of the haste with which it was carried out; its foundations are of all kinds of stones, in many places not worked to fit, but just as the various workmen brought them; and many tombstones and wrought blocks from earlier buildings were pressed into the service. For the circuit was enlarged on every side of the city, and for this reason they hurried the work without respecting any restrictions." Some portions of the wall thus built still remain, especially in the neighbourhood of the Dipylon, where fragments of early tombstones have actually been found built into the wall, as Thucydides describes them; but, side by side with this striking confirmation of his words, we also have a slight difficulty to explain. His statement leaves no room for doubt as to the existence of the earlier circuit of town wall, which we have already seen to be both probable in itself and implied by clear though scanty evidence. But that evidence shows that, at least in the neighbourhood of the Dipylon Gate, the earlier and the later circuit must have nearly coincided; and along the ridges of

¹ I. 89. 3.² I. 93.

the hills to the west of the Acropolis the natural conformation of the ground allows but little variation in the line of a defensive wall. We need not, however, press too literally the force of the expres-



WALL SOUTH OF DIPYLON GATE.

The lower part built by Themistocles, the upper part a later repair. In front, on the right, is the outer (and later) wall.

sion *πανταχῇ*, on every side; the general sense of the passage could accord very fairly with the facts if we suppose that the later circuit exceeded the earlier limits in the comparatively level ground to the north and to the east of the Acropolis, where there was more scope for a growing city, and where the modern town has now exceeded the limits of the ancient.

The leading spirit in the restoration of Athens was Themistocles; and his aims were not restricted to the rebuilding or enlarging of the walls of the town. He seems to have been the first great politician to have grasped the principle, so ably expounded by Captain

Mahan, that the control of the sea is the true foundation of empire, and to have applied it to the conditions of the time and place. Before his days the Athenians depended on Phalerum as their port;¹ he appears to have been the first to recognise and to turn to account the great natural advantages of the Piræus. Thucydides² again gives us the clearest account, and his statement is confirmed by other authorities: "Themistocles persuaded them also to build the rest of the Piræus—a portion of it already existed, built during his tenure of the archonship at Athens—because he thought that the position was a good one, having three natural harbours, and that their taking to the sea was a great advantage for the acquisition of power. For he was the first to advocate the bold course of obtaining control of the sea, and immediately took measures for organising empire. And by his advice they built the wall round the Piræus of the thickness that may still be seen, broad enough for two chariots to pass;³ and there was no rubble or clay within the wall, but it was built throughout of large squared blocks, clamped together with iron and lead; but it was only carried out to half the height of his original design. For he intended, by the height and thickness of the wall, to thwart the enemies' designs, and he thought a few of the least efficient soldiers would suffice to guard it, while the rest would embark upon the ships. For he concentrated

¹ Hdt. vi. 116. &c.; Paus. i. 1, 2.

² i. 93. 2.

³ However we restore the lacuna in the text, this must be the meaning.

his energies on the navy, having observed, I suppose, that the invasion of the Persian army was far easier in transport by sea than by land. And he considered the Piræus more advantageous in position than the inland city; and often advised the Athenians, if ever they were to be hard pressed by land, to transfer themselves to the harbour town, and to concentrate all their resistance in their navy."

Before considering whether there are any extant remains of these walls of Themistocles, it will be best to take a brief survey of the later history of the fortifications of Athens. His policy, which was ultimately taken up and extended by Pericles, was for a time discredited after his disgrace and exile, and the work



MARBLE DRUMS.

Built into the north wall of the Acropolis.

done under Cimon proceeded upon different lines. There is, however, a piece of wall in Athens which, though we have no record of its erection, must have been built in the time of Themistocles;

and this is the wall, still extant, along the north side of the Acropolis. This wall, unlike that on the east and south, follows the contours of the rock in a series of short stretches separated by angles, and there are built into it many columns, architraves, and other fragments of the buildings destroyed by the Persians; thus it offers a strik-

point south of the western end of the Parthenon, and thence again to the corner of the south-western bastion. To the splendid sweep of this wall is mainly due the symmetrical and regular plan that impresses any visitor to the Acropolis, and that forms so conspicuous a feature in the map of Athens. And it was not carried out without considerable engineering skill; the rock falls away rapidly on the southern side, and the old Pelasgian fortification is a considerable distance within the Cimonian wall, which is built of sufficient height and thickness to bring the plateau on this side up to the level of the highest platform of the Acropolis, and to support the immense weight of the earth that had to be piled up within it for this purpose. This wall of Cimon was not, in fact, a fortification wall, but a terrace wall. For the purposes of defence the earlier line had sufficed; but Cimon's object was to make the whole Acropolis a worthy centre of the city, itself a dedication to Athena, and for this purpose he gave it the broad and level platform and the symmetry of shape that still characterise it. On the north side he contented himself with finishing the wall of Themistocles, raising the level of the ground some two or three feet, and building into it the staircase that descends to the grotto of Agraulos; at the western entrance more extensive additions were necessary, if the approach was to be worthy of the enlarged precinct to which it led. We have seen that there was a bastion projecting to the south of the entrance of



BASTION AND TEMPLE OF NIKE, FROM BELOW.

the old Pelasgic fortification, and probably enclosing a shrine of Athena, the Giver of Victory. This bastion was enclosed in a rectangular projection uniform with the south wall, and a gate-house or propylæa was built to the north of it, of which some traces may still be seen beneath the more magnificent building of Pericles. This gate-house faced rather to the south-west; one of the antæ that enclosed it may still be seen outside the later propylæa on the south, and the line of its foundation may also be traced in the rock in the later gateway. The gate-house was set at an obtuse angle to the old Pelasgian wall, of which a considerable portion had been left standing here, and formed the boundary of the precinct of Artemis Brauronia. This rough early wall was evidently

thought to be out of keeping with its new surroundings; and so it was faced with thin slabs of marble, and at its base were set steps of the same material, which returned to border the bastion on the south. Just outside the gate stood a tripod on a base. All these arrangements can still be clearly traced where they project to the south of the later propylæa. The date of the gate-house and its appurtenances has been disputed, and some authorities prefer to assign it to the time of Pisistratus; but it does not seem appropriate to the entrance of what was, in his days, still a fortress, and the material of the anta, steps, and casing of the Pelasgic wall, which is Pentelic marble, seems decisive against a sixth-century date.

Themistocles had advised the Athenians to trust to the sea, and, if they were hard pressed, to transfer their city to the Piræus. It was a brilliant adaptation of the spirit of this policy to build the famous Long Walls, connecting the city with its harbour town, and so to make Athens itself practically into a seaport. Pausanias attributes this design to Themistocles; Plutarch informs us that Cimon began the Long Walls, and himself contributed to the heavy expense of laying foundations of shingle and heavy stones across the marsh; but this must have been a lengthy undertaking, and the completion of the Long Walls as well as of the Wall of the Piræus must be attributed to Pericles; the whole system of fortification was a necessary condition of his policy. We learn indeed from Thucydides that

thought to be out of keeping with its new surroundings; and so it was faced with thin slabs of marble, and at its base were set steps of the same material, which returned to border the bastion on the south. Just outside the gate stood a tripod on a base. All these arrangements can still be clearly traced where they project to the south of the later propylæa. The date of the gate-house and its appurtenances has been disputed, and some authorities prefer to assign it to the time of Pisistratus; but it does not seem appropriate to the entrance of what was, in his days, still a fortress, and the material of the anta, steps, and casing of the Pelasgic wall, which is Pentelic marble, seems decisive against a sixth-century date.

Themistocles had advised the Athenians to trust to the sea, and, if they were hard pressed, to transfer their city to the Piræus. It was a brilliant adaptation of the spirit of this policy to build the famous Long Walls, connecting the city with its harbour town, and so to make Athens itself practically into a seaport. Pausanias attributes this design to Themistocles; Plutarch informs us that Cimon began the Long Walls, and himself contributed to the heavy expense of laying foundations of shingle and heavy stones across the marsh; but this must have been a lengthy undertaking, and the completion of the Long Walls as well as of the Wall of the Piræus must be attributed to Pericles; the whole system of fortification was a necessary condition of his policy. We learn indeed from Thucydides that

the bay at its western end. The proof that the latter is the correct position of Phalerum is given in the chapter on the Piræus; here it concerns us to notice that a wall connecting Athens with the east end of the Phaleric Bay would be perfectly useless as a defence for with the Piraic wall it would form a triangle of which the base is the open sandy beach of the Phaleric Bay. This beach, as we have seen, offers easy landing, and was never protected in any way against invasion, so that an enemy, by a sudden descent, could at any time have established himself within the defences of the city. On the other hand, the whole circuit of the Piraic peninsula, though it is rocky and ill adapted for landing, was defended by a wall close to the sea, of which considerable remains may still be seen; and so, if the two Long Walls reached from Athens to either end of its junction with the land, the circle of fortification would be complete and unassailable. The architect who built the Long Walls was Callicrates, the same man who designed the temple of Wingless Victory and assisted Ictinus in the construction of the Parthenon.

With the completion of the walls of the city and the Piræus, and the Long Walls to connect them, the fortifications of Athens took the form which they retained all through the days of independent Greece; but not without being destroyed and rebuilt upon several occasions. The story is familiar how, after the fall of Athens at the close of the Peloponnesian War, Lysander caused the walls of the Piræus and the Long Walls to be pulled

own to the sound of the flute, while the Spartan allies kept high festival over what they called the beginning of freedom. The fortress of Munychia, however, which had been built by Hippias before the Piræus was fortified,¹ was only partially dismantled; for Thrasybulus, after his bold descent from Phyle, seized and held it, until the expulsion of the Thirty Tyrants. The first thing Conon did, after his victory at Cnidus had restored Athens to something like her former state, was to rebuild the Long Walls; and later travellers, such as Pausanias, looked upon the remains they saw as the work of Conon, though the walls had undergone many vicissitudes in the meanwhile. We have many records, both in the works of historians and in inscriptions, of repairs or restorations of the walls — especially after the battle of Chæronea, and again during the administration of Habron the son of Lycurgus. Demetrius Poliorcetes, during his occupation of Athens, demolished the fort on Munychia, and built one on the Museum Hill. When Philip V. of Macedon attacked Athens, in 200 B.C., Livy says that the Long Walls were in ruins; and Sulla built a good deal of what was left of them into the mound he raised against the city by the Dipylon Gate; when he captured Athens he destroyed the city wall from the Sacred Gate to the Piraic. Calenus, Cæsar's legate, found the Piræus an unwall'd town in 48 B.C.; and probably in later times the Long Walls as well as the walls of the Piræus remained a memory only; they were useless when the

¹ Arist. *Ath. Pol.* c. 38.

naval power of Athens was gone. The city walls, on the other hand, were renewed and even increased. Hadrian added a large new quarter, and there are records of fortification, now needful against barbarian inroads, under Valerian and Justinian. These probably followed the old lines. In the days of Frankish and Turkish rule the enclosure of the town was only a small oblong north of the Acropolis, as may be seen in old



THE ACROPOLIS FROM THE WEST.
From Stuart's *Antiquities of Athens*.

views of Athens; its chief interest for us lies in the fact that its western edge followed and so preserved in part the Stoa of Attalus. The Acropolis was again made into a citadel; its walls were cased with masonry and supported with buttresses; at its western approach a series of batteries and outworks were built which recall the arrangements of the primitive Pelasgicon or "Nine Gates"; the Odeum of Herodes was included in the defences, and on the southern wing of the Pro-

pylæa was built the Frankish tower which forms so conspicuous a landmark in early pictures of the Acropolis. Last of all, in the War of Independence, Odysseus Androutsos built the bastion over the Clepsydra, in order to secure a water supply for the defenders of the Acropolis. This bastion and the Frankish tower, as well as the later outworks at the western end of the Acropolis, have now been cleared away. Some of this destruction of more recent monuments, though less reprehensible in Athens than elsewhere, is to be regretted. But the modern authorities have been guided almost exclusively by the recollection of the glory of Athens in classical times, and have not unnaturally ignored the records of an age when she was but a provincial town, with little architectural character beyond what was bequeathed by "the splendour of her prime."

This brief historical survey will suffice to prepare us for observing the actual remains of the walls of Athens, and to show us the period and character of the work which we must expect to find in various places. The circuit of the city itself never appears to have been completely destroyed after it was once built by Themistocles; but it was so often restored or repaired that we should not be surprised to find later works in any part of it. Vitruvius records that the sides facing Hymettus and Pentelicus were built of brick—probably unburnt brick; and so in these portions we could not expect to find anything but foundations left, unless it belonged to Roman imperial times. Its line can be traced with

pylæa was built the Frankish tower which forms so conspicuous a landmark in early pictures of the Acropolis. Last of all, in the War of Independence, Odysseus Androutsos built the bastion over the Clepsydra, in order to secure a water supply for the defenders of the Acropolis. This bastion and the Frankish tower, as well as the later outworks at the western end of the Acropolis, have now been cleared away. Some of this destruction of more recent monuments, though less reprehensible in Athens than elsewhere, is to be regretted. But the modern authorities have been guided almost exclusively by the recollection of the glory of Athens in classical times, and have not unnaturally ignored the records of an age when she was but a provincial town, with little architectural character beyond what was bequeathed by "the splendour of her prime."

This brief historical survey will suffice to prepare us for observing the actual remains of the walls of Athens, and to show us the period and character of the work which we must expect to find in various places. The circuit of the city itself never appears to have been completely destroyed after it was once built by Themistocles; but it was so often restored or repaired that we should not be surprised to find later works in any part of it. Vitruvius records that the sides facing Hymettus and Pentelicus were built of brick—probably unburnt brick; and so in these portions we could not expect to find anything but foundations left, unless it belonged to Roman imperial times. Its line can be traced with

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
TILLYN - 100

point south of the western end of the Parthenon, and thence again to the corner of the south-western bastion. To the splendid sweep of this wall is mainly due the symmetrical and regular plan that impresses any visitor to the Acropolis, and that forms so conspicuous a feature in the map of Athens. And it was not carried out without considerable engineering skill; the rock falls away rapidly on the southern side, and the old Pelasgian fortification is a considerable distance within the Cimonian wall, which is built of sufficient height and thickness to bring the plateau on this side up to the level of the highest platform of the Acropolis, and to support the immense weight of the earth that had to be piled up within it for this purpose. This wall of Cimon was not, in fact, a fortification wall, but a terrace wall. For the purposes of defence the earlier line had sufficed; but Cimon's object was to make the whole Acropolis a worthy centre of the city, itself a dedication to Athena, and for this purpose he gave it the broad and level platform and the symmetry of shape that still characterise it. On the north side he contented himself with finishing the wall of Themistocles, raising the level of the ground some two or three feet, and building into it the staircase that descends to the grotto of Agraulos; at the western entrance more extensive additions were necessary, if the approach was to be worthy of the enlarged precinct to which it led. We have seen that there was a bastion projecting to the south of the entrance of



BASTION AND TEMPLE OF NIKE, FROM BELOW.

the old Pelasgic fortification, and probably enclosing a shrine of Athena, the Giver of Victory. This bastion was enclosed in a rectangular projection uniform with the south wall, and a gate-house or propylæa was built to the north of it, of which some traces may still be seen beneath the more magnificent building of Pericles. This gate-house faced rather to the south-west; one of the antæ that enclosed it may still be seen outside the later propylæa on the south, and the line of its foundation may also be traced in the rock in the later gateway. The gate-house was set at an obtuse angle to the old Pelasgian wall, of which a considerable portion had been left standing here, and formed the boundary of the precinct of Artemis Brauronia. This rough early wall was evidently

his energies on the navy, having observed, I suppose, that the invasion of the Persian army was far easier in transport by sea than by land. And he considered the Piræus more advantageous in position than the inland city; and often advised the Athenians, if ever they were to be hard pressed by land, to transfer themselves to the harbour town, and to concentrate all their resistance in their navy."

Before considering whether there are any extant remains of these walls of Themistocles, it will be best to take a brief survey of the later history of the fortifications of Athens. His policy, which was ultimately taken up and extended by Pericles, was for a time discredited after his disgrace and exile, and the work



MARBLE DRUMS.

Built into the north wall of the Acropolis.

done under Cimon proceeded upon different lines. There is, however, a piece of wall in Athens which, though we have no record of its erection, must have been built in the time of Themistocles; and this is the wall, still extant, along the north side of the Acropolis. This wall, unlike that on the east and south, follows the contours of the rock in a series of short stretches separated by angles, and there are built into it many columns, architraves, and other fragments of the buildings destroyed by the Persians; thus it offers a strik-

point south of the western end of the Parthenon, and thence again to the corner of the south-western bastion. To the splendid sweep of this wall is mainly due the symmetrical and regular plan that impresses any visitor to the Acropolis, and that forms so conspicuous a feature in the map of Athens. And it was not carried out without considerable engineering skill; the rock falls away rapidly on the southern side, and the old Pelasgian fortification is a considerable distance within the Cimonian wall, which is built of sufficient height and thickness to bring the plateau on this side up to the level of the highest platform of the Acropolis, and to support the immense weight of the earth that had to be piled up within it for this purpose. This wall of Cimon was not, in fact, a fortification wall, but a terrace wall. For the purposes of defence the earlier line had sufficed; but Cimon's object was to make the whole Acropolis a worthy centre of the city, itself a dedication to Athena, and for this purpose he gave it the broad and level platform and the symmetry of shape that still characterise it. On the north side he contented himself with finishing the wall of Themistocles, raising the level of the ground some two or three feet, and building into it the staircase that descends to the grotto of Agraules; at the western entrance more extensive additions were necessary, if the approach was to be worthy of the enlarged precinct to which it led. We have seen that there was a bastion projecting to the south of the entrance of



BASTION AND TEMPLE OF NIKE, FROM BELOW.

the old Pelasgic fortification, and probably enclosing a shrine of Athena, the Giver of Victory. This bastion was enclosed in a rectangular projection uniform with the south wall, and a gate-house or propylæa was built to the north of it, of which some traces may still be seen beneath the more magnificent building of Pericles. This gate-house faced rather to the south-west; one of the antæ that enclosed it may still be seen outside the later propylæa on the south, and the line of its foundation may also be traced in the rock in the later gateway. The gate-house was set at an obtuse angle to the old Pelasgian wall, of which a considerable portion had been left standing here, and formed the boundary of the precinct of Artemis Brauronia. This rough early wall was evidently

thought to be out of keeping with its new surroundings; and so it was faced with thin slabs of marble, and at its base were set steps of the same material, which returned to border the bastion on the south. Just outside the gate stood a tripod on a base. All these arrangements can still be clearly traced where they project to the south of the later propylæa. The date of the gate-house and its appurtenances has been disputed, and some authorities prefer to assign it to the time of Pisistratus; but it does not seem appropriate to the entrance of what was, in his days, still a fortress, and the material of the anta, steps, and casing of the Pelasgic wall, which is Pentelic marble, seems decisive against a sixth-century date.

Themistocles had advised the Athenians to trust to the sea, and, if they were hard pressed, to transfer their city to the Piræus. It was a brilliant adaptation of the spirit of this policy to build the famous Long Walls, connecting the city with its harbour town, and so to make Athens itself practically into a seaport. Pausanias attributes this design to Themistocles; Plutarch informs us that Cimon began the Long Walls, and himself contributed to the heavy expense of laying foundations of shingle and heavy stones across the marsh; but this must have been a lengthy undertaking, and the completion of the Long Walls as well as of the Wall of the Piræus must be attributed to Pericles; the whole system of fortification was a necessary condition of his policy. We learn indeed from Thucydides that

the Long Walls were begun about 460 B.C., and finished about 458; and as these dates belong to the early days of the ascendancy of Pericles, and fall between the banishment of Cimon in 461 and his recall in 458, they preclude the possibility of Cimon's taking part in the work, unless we suppose that it had already been begun before 461 B.C., but had not got beyond foundations, and that it was seriously taken up for completion in 460. In this year Socrates, then a boy of ten, may well have heard Pericles make the speech in favour of building the walls between¹ the city and the Piræus, according to the story told by him in Plato's *Gorgias*.²

The two Long Walls were known as the Piraic or northern and the Phaleric or southern; they ran parallel to one another for most of their length, and were 550 feet apart. Considerable remains of both were seen by Leake; but they have now almost entirely disappeared. At each end they diverged, to join advantageous points in the circuits of the city and of the Piræus. A strange error as to the position of the Phaleric wall is found in most modern topographies and maps of Athens, though not in Leake. This is the supposition that it ran to what is now called Old Phalerum at the eastern end of the Phaleric Bay, instead of to the corner of the Piraic promontory that encloses

¹ This meaning of τὸ διὰ μέσου τεῖχος is defended by Leake, and seems probable. The interpretation as "the middle or third wall" is that of some commentators on Plato; but Dio Chrysostom certainly uses the expression in the former sense, *Or.* 6. p. 87. See note on "the third Long Wall" at end of chapter.

² 455 E.

the bay at its western end. The proof that the latter is the correct position of Phalerum is given in the chapter on the Piræus; here it concerns us to notice that a wall connecting Athens with the east end of the Phaleric Bay would be perfectly useless as a defence, for with the Piraic wall it would form a triangle of which the base is the open sandy beach of the Phaleric Bay. This beach, as we have seen, offers easy landing, and was never protected in any way against invasion, so that an enemy, by a sudden descent, could at any time have established himself within the defences of the city. On the other hand, the whole circuit of the Piraic peninsula, though it is rocky and ill adapted for landing, was defended by a wall close to the sea, of which considerable remains may still be seen; and so, if the two Long Walls reached from Athens to either end of its junction with the land, the circle of fortification would be complete and unassailable. The architect who built the Long Walls was Callicrates, the same man who designed the temple of Wingless Victory and assisted Ictinus in the construction of the Parthenon.

With the completion of the walls of the city and the Piræus, and the Long Walls to connect them, the fortifications of Athens took the form which they retained all through the days of independent Greece; but not without being destroyed and rebuilt upon several occasions. The story is familiar how, after the fall of Athens at the close of the Peloponnesian War, Lysander caused the walls of the Piræus and the Long Walls to be pulled

down to the sound of the flute, while the Spartan allies kept high festival over what they called the beginning of freedom. The fortress of Munychia, however, which had been built by Hippias before the Piræus was fortified,¹ was only partially dismantled; for Thrasybulus, after his bold descent from Phyle, seized and held it, until the expulsion of the Thirty Tyrants. The first thing Conon did, after his victory at Cnidus had restored Athens to something like her former state, was to rebuild the Long Walls; and later travellers, such as Pausanias, looked upon the remains they saw as the work of Conon, though the walls had undergone many vicissitudes in the meanwhile. We have many records, both in the works of historians and in inscriptions, of repairs or restorations of the walls — especially after the battle of Chæronea, and again during the administration of Habron the son of Lycurgus. Demetrius Poliorcetes, during his occupation of Athens, demolished the fort on Munychia, and built one on the Museum Hill. When Philip V. of Macedon attacked Athens, in 200 B.C., Livy says that the Long Walls were in ruins; and Sulla built a good deal of what was left of them into the mound he raised against the city by the Dipylon Gate; when he captured Athens he destroyed the city wall from the Sacred Gate to the Piraic. Calenus, Cæsar's legate, found the Piræus an unwallèd town in 48 B.C.; and probably in later times the Long Walls as well as the walls of the Piræus remained a memory only; they were useless when the

¹ Arist. *Ath. Pol.* c. 38.

naval power of Athens was gone. The city walls, on the other hand, were renewed and even increased. Hadrian added a large new quarter, and there are records of fortification, now needful against barbarian inroads, under Valerian and Justinian. These probably followed the old lines. In the days of Frankish and Turkish rule the enclosure of the town was only a small oblong north of the Acropolis, as may be seen in old



THE ACROPOLIS FROM THE WEST.
From Stuart's *Antiquities of Athens*.

views of Athens; its chief interest for us lies in the fact that its western edge followed and so preserved in part the Stoa of Attalus. The Acropolis was again made into a citadel; its walls were cased with masonry and supported with buttresses; at its western approach a series of batteries and outworks were built which recall the arrangements of the primitive Pelasgicon or "Nine Gates"; the Odeum of Herodes was included in the defences, and on the southern wing of the Pro-

pylæa was built the Frankish tower which forms so conspicuous a landmark in early pictures of the Acropolis. Last of all, in the War of Independence, Odysseus Androutsos built the bastion over the Clepsydra, in order to secure a water supply for the defenders of the Acropolis. This bastion and the Frankish tower, as well as the later outworks at the western end of the Acropolis, have now been cleared away. Some of this destruction of more recent monuments, though less reprehensible in Athens than elsewhere, is to be regretted. But the modern authorities have been guided almost exclusively by the recollection of the glory of Athens in classical times, and have not unnaturally ignored the records of an age when she was but a provincial town, with little architectural character beyond what was bequeathed by "the splendour of her prime."

This brief historical survey will suffice to prepare us for observing the actual remains of the walls of Athens, and to show us the period and character of the work which we must expect to find in various places. The circuit of the city itself never appears to have been completely destroyed after it was once built by Themistocles; but it was so often restored or repaired that we should not be surprised to find later works in any part of it. Vitruvius records that the sides facing Hymettus and Pentelicus were built of brick — probably unburnt brick; and so in these portions we could not expect to find anything but foundations left, unless it belonged to Roman imperial times. Its line can be traced with

northern wall was built several years before the southern, it would, if double, have been tenable alone as a means of communication in the interim.

(b) *On the Length of the Walls, as given in Thucydides, II. 13.*—If the figures given in this passage are right, it is impossible to reconcile them with extant remains and geographical conditions as recognised by modern topographers. The circuit of the city wall is far too long; on the other hand, the length of both the Piraic and Phaleric Long Walls is too short. The length given for the circuit of Piræus and Munychia is about right; but, if only half of it required guarding, the Long Walls must have joined it much farther from each other than they are usually drawn; they must, when they ceased to be parallel, have diverged broadly, to join either edge of the Piraic peninsula; and this demands a considerable increase in their length.

The measures in stades given by Thucydides are: Phaleric Wall, 35; circuit of city (exclusive of space between Long Walls), 43;¹ Piraic Wall, 40; circuit of Piræus and Munychia, total, 60; guarded, 30. The change required to reconcile these measurements with the facts is a simple one. Something has to be taken off the measure of the city circuit and added to that of the Long Walls. This is easily done if we imagine that

¹ The measurement of 60 stades, given by Aristodemus and others, is obviously a rough estimate, like the 30,000 spectators in the theatre. The scholiast's attempt to reconcile it with Thucydides' estimate of 43 by reckoning the unguarded part between the Long Walls at 17 is absurd. Even as measured on Curtius' map, this distance only amounts to 5 stades.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

thought to be out of keeping with its new surroundings; and so it was faced with thin slabs of marble, and at its base were set steps of the same material, which returned to border the bastion on the south. Just outside the gate stood a tripod on a base. All these arrangements can still be clearly traced where they project to the south of the later propylæa. The date of the gate-house and its appurtenances has been disputed, and some authorities prefer to assign it to the time of Pisistratus; but it does not seem appropriate to the entrance of what was, in his days, still a fortress, and the material of the anta, steps, and casing of the Pelasgic wall, which is Pentelic marble, seems decisive against a sixth-century date.

Themistocles had advised the Athenians to trust to the sea, and, if they were hard pressed, to transfer their city to the Piræus. It was a brilliant adaptation of the spirit of this policy to build the famous Long Walls, connecting the city with its harbour town, and so to make Athens itself practically into a seaport. Pausanias attributes this design to Themistocles; Plutarch informs us that Cimon began the Long Walls, and himself contributed to the heavy expense of laying foundations of shingle and heavy stones across the marsh; but this must have been a lengthy undertaking, and the completion of the Long Walls as well as of the Wall of the Piræus must be attributed to Pericles; the whole system of fortification was a necessary condition of his policy. We learn indeed from Thucydides that

the Long Walls were begun about 460 B.C., and finished about 458; and as these dates belong to the early days of the ascendancy of Pericles, and fall between the banishment of Cimon in 461 and his recall in 458, they preclude the possibility of Cimon's taking part in the work, unless we suppose that it had already been begun before 461 B.C., but had not got beyond foundations, and that it was seriously taken up for completion in 460. In this year Socrates, then a boy of ten, may well have heard Pericles make the speech in favour of building the walls between¹ the city and the Piræus, according to the story told by him in Plato's *Gorgias*.²

The two Long Walls were known as the Piraic or northern and the Phaleric or southern; they ran parallel to one another for most of their length, and were 550 feet apart. Considerable remains of both were seen by Leake; but they have now almost entirely disappeared. At each end they diverged, to join advantageous points in the circuits of the city and of the Piræus. A strange error as to the position of the Phaleric wall is found in most modern topographies and maps of Athens, though not in Leake. This is the supposition that it ran to what is now called Old Phalerum at the eastern end of the Phaleric Bay, instead of to the corner of the Piraic promontory that encloses

¹ This meaning of τὸ διὰ μέσου τεῖχος is defended by Leake, and seems probable. The interpretation as "the middle or third wall" is that of some commentators on Plato; but Dio Chrysostom certainly uses the expression in the former sense, *Or.* 6. p. 87. See note on "the third Long Wall" at end of chapter.

² 455 E.

the bay at its western end. The proof that the latter is the correct position of Phalerum is given in the chapter on the Piræus; here it concerns us to notice that a wall connecting Athens with the east end of the Phaleric Bay would be perfectly useless as a defence, for with the Piraic wall it would form a triangle of which the base is the open sandy beach of the Phaleric Bay. This beach, as we have seen, offers easy landing, and was never protected in any way against invasion, so that an enemy, by a sudden descent, could at any time have established himself within the defences of the city. On the other hand, the whole circuit of the Piraic peninsula, though it is rocky and ill adapted for landing, was defended by a wall close to the sea, of which considerable remains may still be seen; and so, if the two Long Walls reached from Athens to either end of its junction with the land, the circle of fortification would be complete and unassailable. The architect who built the Long Walls was Callicrates, the same man who designed the temple of Wingless Victory and assisted Ictinus in the construction of the Parthenon.

With the completion of the walls of the city and the Piræus, and the Long Walls to connect them, the fortifications of Athens took the form which they retained all through the days of independent Greece; but not without being destroyed and rebuilt upon several occasions. The story is familiar how, after the fall of Athens at the close of the Peloponnesian War, Lysander caused the walls of the Piræus and the Long Walls to be pulled

down to the sound of the flute, while the Spartan allies kept high festival over what they called the beginning of freedom. The fortress of Munychia, however, which had been built by Hippias before the Piræus was fortified,¹ was only partially dismantled; for Thrasybulus, after his bold descent from Phyle, seized and held it, until the expulsion of the Thirty Tyrants. The first thing Conon did, after his victory at Cnidus had restored Athens to something like her former state, was to rebuild the Long Walls; and later travellers, such as Pausanias, looked upon the remains they saw as the work of Conon, though the walls had undergone many vicissitudes in the meanwhile. We have many records, both in the works of historians and in inscriptions, of repairs or restorations of the walls — especially after the battle of Chæronea, and again during the administration of Habron the son of Lycurgus. Demetrius Poliorcetes, during his occupation of Athens, demolished the fort on Munychia, and built one on the Museum Hill. When Philip V. of Macedon attacked Athens, in 200 B.C., Livy says that the Long Walls were in ruins; and Sulla built a good deal of what was left of them into the mound he raised against the city by the Dipylon Gate; when he captured Athens he destroyed the city wall from the Sacred Gate to the Piraic. Calenus, Cæsar's legate, found the Piræus an unwallled town in 48 B.C.; and probably in later times the Long Walls as well as the walls of the Piræus remained a memory only; they were useless when the

¹ Arist. *Ath. Pol.* c. 38.

naval power of Athens was gone. The city walls, on the other hand, were renewed and even increased. Hadrian added a large new quarter, and there are records of fortification, now needful against barbarian inroads, under Valerian and Justinian. These probably followed the old lines. In the days of Frankish and Turkish rule the enclosure of the town was only a small oblong north of the Acropolis, as may be seen in old



THE ACROPOLIS FROM THE WEST.
From Stuart's *Antiquities of Athens*.

views of Athens; its chief interest for us lies in the fact that its western edge followed and so preserved in part the Stoa of Attalus. The Acropolis was again made into a citadel; its walls were cased with masonry and supported with buttresses; at its western approach a series of batteries and outworks were built which recall the arrangements of the primitive Pelasgicon or "Nine Gates"; the Odeum of Herodes was included in the defences, and on the southern wing of the Pro-

pylæa was built the Frankish tower which forms so conspicuous a landmark in early pictures of the Acropolis. Last of all, in the War of Independence, Odysseus Androutsos built the bastion over the Clepsydra, in order to secure a water supply for the defenders of the Acropolis. This bastion and the Frankish tower, as well as the later outworks at the western end of the Acropolis, have now been cleared away. Some of this destruction of more recent monuments, though less reprehensible in Athens than elsewhere, is to be regretted. But the modern authorities have been guided almost exclusively by the recollection of the glory of Athens in classical times, and have not unnaturally ignored the records of an age when she was but a provincial town, with little architectural character beyond what was bequeathed by "the splendour of her prime."

This brief historical survey will suffice to prepare us for observing the actual remains of the walls of Athens, and to show us the period and character of the work which we must expect to find in various places. The circuit of the city itself never appears to have been completely destroyed after it was once built by Themistocles; but it was so often restored or repaired that we should not be surprised to find later works in any part of it. Vitruvius records that the sides facing Hymettus and Pentelicus were built of brick—probably unburnt brick; and so in these portions we could not expect to find anything but foundations left, unless it belonged to Roman imperial times. Its line can be traced with

From Homer it would appear that the two buildings were identical, the well-built house of Erechtheus, and the temple of Athena in which she established him and his worship. For Athena goes to the house of Erechtheus as her favourite abode, just as Aphrodite goes to her temple at Paphos. The relation of the temple of Athena to the palace of Erechtheus becomes clearer in the light of the extant remains. The house of Erechtheus was originally just like any other house of the same period in Greece, and can hardly have been anything else than the palace of the early kings of Athens, placed in the best position on their citadel, like the palaces of Mycenæ and Tiryns. This palace doubtless had, like all others, its altar of Zeus *Ἐρκεῖος* in the court, and its Hestia in the hall; and these were the centres of worship for the king and his household, and so for the state generally, in primitive times, just as in later times civic worship centred in the Tholus and the Prytaneum in the Agora. It is, however, unusual to find the temple of the chief deity identical with such a centre of civic institutions, and there is some difference of opinion whether this was the case in Athens. On the one hand we have the Homeric passages, and the unusual coincidence of position between the palace and the early temple; on the other hand the sacred objects associated with the most primitive religious cults of Athens, the olive tree of Athena, and the "Sea" or salt spring of Posidon, together with the trident marks from which it rose, are situated to the north of the palace, within or close to

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
1000 5th Ave. New York 17, N.Y.

hope that its sanctity would protect them as they left the Acropolis. The official title of the temple in the time before the Persian Wars was the Hecatompedon (or hundred-foot temple), a title which, though not of a primitive appearance, was so far consecrated by tradition that it was later transferred to the cella of the Parthenon, together with the measurement from which its name was derived. This measurement of one hundred Attic feet is approximately the length of the temple before the peristyle was added, and so the name must have been given to it in its earliest state. The inscription which records the name dates from a time shortly before the Persian wars; it is also valuable as giving some indication of the use of the peculiar arrangements in the plan of the temple. It is ordered that the state treasurers are to open the chambers (*οἰκήματα*) in the Hecatompedon; and this may imply that the western compartment of the temple, together with the chambers opening out of it, were used as a treasury. The indication is chiefly important for the later history of the temple, and for its relation to the other buildings—the Parthenon and the Erechtheum—that superseded it either wholly or in part. For a theory has been maintained by Professor Dörpfeld, that these chambers not only were a treasury in early times, but were rebuilt after their destruction by the Persians, and served as a treasury in later times also; while Professor Furtwängler believes that they were not originally built as treasuries, but that the peculiar division of the western part of the

early temple served the same purposes of religious ritual as were served by the similar division of the later Erechtheum. So far as the time before the Persian wars is concerned, there is hardly enough evidence to decide this controversy.

As to the appearance of the Mycenæan palace on the Acropolis, we can only judge from the similar buildings that have been found at Mycenæ, Tiryns, and elsewhere; nor have we much more evidence as to the architectural features of the early temple in the first stage of its existence. There are indeed many remains of architecture and of sculpture of an early date that have been found on the Acropolis; but it is not easy to identify any of them with certainty as belonging to this temple, nor indeed is it very probable that any of them do belong to it; for almost all its architectural features must have been destroyed when the peristyle was added, probably fifty years or so before the fragments found on the Acropolis were buried.

The appearance of the temple after the peristyle had been added by Pisistratus may be realised with a fair degree of certainty, considering that it has been destroyed to the foundations. For the capitals and drums of columns, and the portions of architrave, frieze, and cornice built into the northern wall of the Acropolis have been identified by Professor Dörpfeld as belonging to this building, and by their help he has made a restoration which may claim to be more than conjectural. Some figures from its pediments have been recovered

and pieced together, and may now be seen in the Acropolis Museum. The colonnade was of the Doric order, with six columns at each end and twelve on each side; the form of the capitals is such as one would expect in the latter part of the sixth century, being intermediate between the bulging, rather clumsy shape of an earlier period and the refined profile of the fifth century. We must, of course, imagine the rough Piraic limestone of which the building consists as covered with stucco, and all its mouldings enlivened by brilliant colours, mostly blue or red; the metopes and cornice were of Parian marble; and this more precious material was not hidden by a complete coat of colour, though the decorative patterns or other designs painted on it enhanced the beauty of its texture. The metopes probably contained mythological scenes, though no trace of their paintings has survived; but the pediments were filled with sculpture in the round in Parian marble, and of these several figures have been recovered.

The subject of one of these pediments was the battle of the Gods and Giants—a favourite subject for such composition in early times. Scenes from a similar combat had already figured in some of the early pedimental groups in Piraic limestone that were found on the Acropolis—notably the one which contained the three-bodied Typhon and his mate, Echidna. In groups of the gigantomachy Athena is usually a prominent figure, but the place of honour, in the front of the combatants, or, by an easily understood convention, in the

centre of a pediment, is usually occupied by Zeus. It was a bold innovation, and characteristic of his age and place, for the Athenian artist to give this place of honour to Athena herself; and the fact is symbolical of the history of Athenian religion. In the age of Pisistratus there was a tendency throughout Greece to organise local cults and festivals and myths into a Panhellenic system; and at Athens this tendency was associated with a more or less conscious attempt to glorify the goddess of the city and her worship, and to give her the most prominent place in the Greek pantheon. Of course she was usually represented as occupying this position as the vice-regent of her father Zeus; but in this pediment she actually seems to usurp his place. The extant fragments have not as yet sufficed for the reconstruction of any other of the divine combatants; but of their opponents, the giants, two other prostrate figures have been put together, in addition to the one who lies at the feet of Athena.

Though this early temple of Athena was doubtless the chief temple on the Acropolis before the Persian wars, it cannot be supposed that there were no others. It is, as we have seen, a doubtful matter whether there was another early temple on the site later occupied by the Erechtheum; certainly no clear traces of any such temple remain; nor are there any early walls or foundations elsewhere on the Acropolis that indicate the position of any other shrines. The absence of such

evidence is the more remarkable, since it is known that some of the sites on the Acropolis were sacred from immemorial tradition. Yet, even in a precinct of such ancient sanctity as that of Artemis Brauronia, no traces of a temple have been found, though the rock is, over most of its surface, exposed. We must suppose either that such temples as existed were so roughly built that the rock was not levelled for their foundations, or else that there were merely open precincts or altars, but no temples, in these primitive shrines. On the highest part of the Acropolis there remains a considerable extent of rock in its natural state, surrounded by levelled spaces; on one side this rough platform is bordered by an early piece of wall, on other sides it is scarped and faced by a later wall. It has been conjectured with probability that this rough piece of rock served as the great altar of Athena, at which the hecatombs were offered annually at the Panathenaic festival. There is little else, either in the way of walls or of rock cuttings, that can be assigned with certainty to this early period, if we except certain cisterns, drains, and foundations of chambers near the north-west corner of the Acropolis, beside the Propylæa. This absence of foundations is the more remarkable, since the foundations of the fifth-century buildings, and the earth used to terrace up the Acropolis after the Persian wars, are full of fragments of architecture and sculpture that must have come from temples of the sixth century. Some of these fragments may have been brought from elsewhere to help in filling

up the terrace, just as in later days a certain number of tombstones, which could not originally have been set up on the Acropolis, were carried up there, mostly for building purposes. But it can hardly be doubted that the majority of the early fragments belonged to the temples that stood on the Acropolis in the sixth century,



GREAT ALTAR OF ROCK ON THE LEFT. ON THE RIGHT, NORTH-EAST CORNER OF PARTHENON.

and were destroyed by the Persians when they sacked the city in 480 B.C.; for the sculptured compositions recovered from them are in many cases nearly complete, far more so than would have been at all probable if they had formed part of a miscellaneous mass of rubble brought up from below.

The early history of Attic art, as recorded by these

products of recent excavation on the Acropolis, is considered in another chapter; here we are more concerned to notice the character of the buildings from which they came, so far as it affected the general appearance of the Acropolis in the sixth century. Most of the buildings must have been small shrines or temples, built of rough Piraic limestone and coated with stucco; the sculptures were mostly of the same material; nearly all of them come from pedimental groups in higher or lower relief. It is a curious fact that almost all of them represent exploits of Heracles: one shows his fight with the Lernæan Hydra; two others his wrestling with the Old Man of the Sea, a favourite subject in early art, though not recognised as one of the canonical "Twelve Labours." In another pediment, which shows in one of its ends Echidna, in the other the three-bodied Typhon, we have a scene which, though not properly belonging to the gigantomachy, is closely akin to it. And in representations of gigantomachy, Heracles always takes his place among the gods; it is therefore probable that he appeared also on the pediment over the colonnade built by Pisistratus round the early temple of Athena. This prominence of Heracles in early monuments at Athens came as a surprise to archæologists; we had been used to think of the hero as especially Doric, and in the later democracy his place was almost usurped by Theseus. But we must remember that Heracles is said to have been regarded as a god by the early Athenians, and that he had an impor-

tant early temple in the quarter Melite. His presence in the groups ornamenting so many of the early shrines of Athens need not of course imply that all or even any of them were dedicated to him; but it certainly does show that he and his deeds must have loomed much larger in early Athenian mythology than we should have guessed from literary sources of information. The same inference may be drawn from the frequency with which he occurs on early Attic vases.

Among these smaller shrines the great temple of Athena must have stood out conspicuously even in its earlier state; when it was surrounded by a colonnade and adorned with marble pediments, in the time of Pisistratus, it must have altogether eclipsed its surroundings, and have offered some promise of the splendour that was to supersede it in the next century. Such was the general appearance of the Acropolis when it was taken and burnt by the Persians; and the destruction of all these early temples, greater and smaller alike, was not only a gain to archæology, but even contributed in no small degree to the actual advance of Attic art. Had all these structures survived into the age of Pericles, religious conservatism might well have opposed their destruction, even for such temples as the Parthenon and the Erechtheum to rise above their ruins.

CHAPTER IV

THE TOWN BEFORE THE PERSIAN WARS

WE have already noticed the hill of the Pnyx and the Acropolis as centres of early settlements at Athens ; but there is no doubt that the Acropolis, at least, soon became a sacred citadel, suitable perhaps for the residence of a primitive king and his retainers, but incapable of housing any large body of citizens. With the growth of political feeling, the centre of civic life was transferred to the agora, and the dwellings of the people must have clustered round it, though, until the lower town was provided with a wall of defence, the inhabitants must still have taken refuge in the Acropolis during times of danger. Thucydides says that in this early time the city consisted of the Acropolis and the region to the south of it ; that is to say, the more or less level space that lies in front of the two theatres, and stretches toward the valley of the Ilissus. This statement, though accepted by Curtius and other topographers, and made the basis of their reconstruction of the early town of Athens, has met with much criticism, especially since it does not tally with the results of recent excavations. Thucydides himself seems to regard it as a necessary infer-

ence from the position of certain early temples, but the whole passage has been the subject of controversy; and it therefore seems better to relegate its discussion till later,¹ rather than to take it as the starting-point for a description of the lower town. Perhaps it is too much to hope that we can attain any certain knowledge of the topography of the lower town before the great change associated with the name of Theseus, and celebrated in the festival of the Synœcia. Before that change, Athens was presumably only one of several small townships in Attica. The recognition of Athens as the city, and the concentration there of all political and religious organisation, must have led to a considerable increase in the sacred and public buildings, and even in the town itself, though it is not, of course, to be supposed that either then or later, until the time of the Peloponnesian War, the majority of the population of Attica flocked to Athens. We cannot identify with certainty any of the monuments of the lower town as belonging to the time before the Synœcism; and a topographical order is the only one which it is practical to follow in tracing the architectural history of the town of Athens before the Persian Wars.

The Acropolis was surrounded in early times by various districts,² each of which probably had a separate village settlement of its own; the names of some

¹ See note IV. *a.* at the end of the chapter.

² In the placing of the city demes I have followed Curtius, who gives the view generally accepted, though by no means free from dispute. In most cases there really is not enough definite evidence to lead to a certain decision.

of these early villages are preserved in the later names of the city demes. In front of the western gate of the Acropolis lies the valley between it and the Pnyx hill; and this is connected by the low saddle between Pnyx and Areopagus with the broad stretch of level ground which reaches to the Theseum. This region belonged in later times to the deme Melite; the name has a Phœnician look, which has naturally been emphasised by those who, like Curtius, believe in a Phœnician settlement and Phœnician influence in early Athens; but it must be admitted that recent investigations have lent little or no support to this theory; and the name Melite itself may just as well be derived from the honey for which the neighbouring mountain of Hymettus was famous in classical times; the wild thyme that still gives this honey its characteristic flavour grows just as freely on all the Attic hills. To the north and north-west of the Theseum lay the lowest ground around Athens, with the rich deposit of red clay that gave it the name of "the Potters' Field" (Ceramicus), and that was later to make Attic pottery the most famous in the world for the beauty of its material as well as the skill of its manufacture. The deme of Collytos, stretching from the north side of the Acropolis right up to the slope of Lycabettus, probably represents another early village, which retained into historical times some of its old local festivals, such as the Country Dionysia,¹ though it contained

¹ ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἀγροῦς Διονυσίοις κωμῶδων δυντων ἐν Κολλυτῷ. — Æschin. I. 157.

the most populous and fashionable part of the city; but in ancient times the houses never spread so far in this direction as they have in modern times; the old town always surrounded the Acropolis, instead of reaching away, as the modern town does, into the plain to the north. Between the Acropolis and the Ilissus, on the south-east, is the region which Thucydides and



LYCABETTUS FROM THE ACROPOLIS.
Pentelicus behind.

Professor Curtius believed to have been the earliest centre of civic life. In confirmation of this opinion is the probable situation in this locality of the deme *Κυδαθήναιον*; beyond the Ilissus lies the suburb of Agraë, famous for the celebration of the Lesser Mysteries; and to the west, in the hollow to the south-west of the Pnyx and sloping away to the sea, is the region of *Κοίλη*. A brief study of the actual remains of early date that may

still be seen in these various districts must precede any attempt to reconstruct the early town.

There are traces of a certain number of early shrines nestling close under the rock of the Acropolis, or situated in natural caves beneath it. Just to the north of the western entrance is the Clepsydra, which we have already noticed both in considering the walls¹ and the water supply.² The precipitous cliffs that lie to the north-east of this point were known as the *Μακράι* or Long Rocks, and contained two caves, dedicated to the worship of Apollo and of Pan. That of Apollo is celebrated in Euripides' *Ion* as the place where Apollo met Creusa, and where she later exposed the child that she bore to the god; the cave of Pan was first dedicated to him after the battle of Marathon, in consequence of his apparition to the runner Phidippides on Mt. Artemisium, and the "Panic" terror that he cast over the Persian army. An altar of Pan is also mentioned by Euripides. Some doubt existed as to the exact position of these caves until recently, chiefly because the whole region was deeply buried beneath the rubbish shot from the Acropolis during the earlier excavations, but this was cleared away by M. Cavvadias in 1897 with the most satisfactory results.³

Immediately above the Clepsydra is a shallow cave, which used to be identified as the cave of Apollo; but it contains no votive niches or other indications of dedication, is extremely difficult of access, and must always

¹ See p. 61.

² See pp. 23-24.

³ See 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1897.

have been open and visible, so as to be unsuitable for the tale told of the cave of Apollo. This may, then, be dismissed from consideration. A little farther to the east, separated from this cave by a projecting buttress of rock, is a roughly levelled platform of rock, on which several caves open. The first of these, counting from the west, is a shallow recess in the rock, filled with niches to hold inscribed tablets or other dedications, and similar niches are also to be seen on the face of rock to the east of this cave. In the débris outside were found



CAVE OF APOLLO.

With niches for votive tablets.

several inscriptions or portions of inscriptions, all of them dedications of Roman period to Apollo 'Ἐποάκραιος, ὑπὸ Ἀκραίς, or ὑπὸ Μακραίς;¹ these were on tablets which have evidently been fixed in the niches prepared in the rock. At the back of the rock platform is a second cave, a little deeper, and extending partly

¹ It is singular that nearly all the tablets found in the recent excavations have ὑπὸ Μακραίς, which did not occur in those found earlier.

underneath the wall of the Acropolis, but quite open; this cave has no signs of dedication about it. The projecting mass that bounds the platform on the east is pierced by two caves, of a different character from those we have hitherto noticed; they penetrate deeper into the hill, and have narrow entrances partly blocked by natural pillars of rock, so that they offer complete



CAVE OF PAN.

seclusion, though but narrow space within. Such caves as this are obviously more adapted to the tale of Apollo and Creusa, which must be located in the cave of Apollo; and the cave of Pan must have been of a similar character, since Aristophanes¹ mentions it as a place where seclusion and privacy could be

found. And, moreover, such a cave suits the notion, common to literature and art, of Pan seated in his hole, and piping to the nymphs who dance before him. There can be little doubt, then, that we must recognise in this hollow rock the Πανὸς θακήματα καὶ παρανλίζουσα πέτρα

¹ Lysistr. 911.

μυχώδεσι Μακραῖς. M. Cavvadias suggests that this cave of Pan was identical with the earlier cave of Apollo, and that it was assigned to Pan after the worship of Apollo had been transferred to the open cave with the niches; perhaps it is more probable that one of the two communicating caves to the east of the platform was sacred to Apollo, one to Pan; in any case they suited legend better than ritual; dedications and sacrifices took place in the open recesses of the Μακραῖ, where the foundations of an altar have actually been found. There is also a pit which M. Cavvadias proposes to identify as the tomb of Erechtheus, but any such identification must be regarded as highly conjectural; the only evidence that the tomb of Erechtheus in a χάσμα χθονὸς was close to the Μακραῖ is in the same passage of the *Ion* already quoted, which is far from being convincing.¹

However this may be, the associations of the shrine of Apollo are most interesting, not only from its place in Attic ritual and mythology, but also because it has been quoted as evidence in one of the most difficult and controversial problems in Athenian topography. The worship of Apollo Patrous, as the father of Ion and so the common ancestor of the whole Ionian race, belonged especially to the spot. The great national festival of the Ionic race, in which the Athenians were officially represented,

¹ After mentioning the tomb of Erechtheus, *Ion* adds, Μακραὶ δὲ χῶρος ἐστ' ἐκεῖ κεκλημένος; 'Εκεῖ here may mean merely "at Athens," and if so, the evidence for the tomb of Erechtheus near the Μακραὶ disappears.

and later took the predominant part, was held at Delos; and so we might naturally have expected that the Delian Apollo would be especially associated with the birth-place of his son Ion. This, however, is not the case. The Apollo Patrous who is especially worshipped at Athens is always, in historical times, the Pythian Apollo; Demosthenes expressly says that the Pythian Apollo is Patrous to the Athenians; and Theophrastus' Fussy Man (*Μικροφιλότιμος*) takes his boy to Delphi to make the due offering to Apollo Patrous when he is grown up. Of the *Μακραὶ* and their shrines Ion says expressly *Τιμᾷ σφε Πύθιος ἀστραπαὶ τε Πύθιαι*, and it is difficult to explain the last half of this line except as a reference to the altar of Zeus *Ἀστραπαῖος*, from which at certain seasons men watched for the lightning over Harma, in the direction of Delphi, in order to give the signal for the despatch of the sacred embassy from Athens to the Pythian sanctuary. Whether the Pythian connection of the cult of Apollo beneath the Long Rocks was original or not we have no certain evidence; it may be tempting to refer it to the religious reforms of Epimenides or to the influence of the Alcmaeonidæ at Delphi; but any such theory must be regarded as a mere conjecture, and cannot be made the basis for any further inferences. In the time of Pisistratus, as we shall see, the cult of the Pythian Apollo was officially established in the Pythium near the Ilissus.¹

¹ Whether this shrine of Apollo ὕπ' Ἀκραις was ever called Pythium is a difficult question, discussed in the note at the end of this chapter, p. 145.

To the west of the caves of Apollo and of Pan is a projecting corner of the Acropolis cliff, containing in its western face the entrance of the long cleft which communicates with the top of the enclosure within the walls. This cleft has already been noticed as the probable route of the Persians in their escalade of the Acropolis.¹ Above its western entrance is a flight of steps, of which the lower end is now walled up just within the Acropolis wall. The sanctuary of Agraulos is in the northern face of the rock, just beyond the projecting corner; it is identified from the statements of Herodotus and Pausanias that it was close to the place where the Persians mounted. Probably the cave that is visible at this point belonged to the shrine. It was here that the young men of Athens took their oath on being admitted to the ranks of the Ephebi, and close to it was the Anakeion or temple of the Dioscuri. Farther along are



PIT OF SACRIFICE IN ASCLEPIEUM.
Temple behind.

more recesses and niches cut in the rock, but there is nothing more on the northern or eastern face of the Acropolis that offers any topographical indications. The

¹ See Chapter II. p. 47.

aspect of the eastern end of the southern side of the rock has been completely transformed since the time of the Persian Wars by the curved scarping for the upper part of the Great Theatre. The Asclepieum to the west of this is also an institution of later date, but it probably took the place of an earlier sacred spring which had its own traditions, and probably its own shrine of healing before the worship of Asclepius was introduced into Athens. With it must probably be associated an early pit of sacrifice with polygonal masonry. Beside the spring it was said that Halirrhothius, the son of Poseidon, had done violence to Alcippe, daughter of Ares; and Ares, having slain Halirrhothius, stood his trial on the Areopagus. Several remains of enclosures, of a period before the Persian Wars, seem to show that there was a sacred precinct in this region. A little farther along is a cistern of fine polygonal masonry and remains of early walls; but the western end of the south side of the Acropolis is as completely altered by the Stoa of Eumenes and the Odeum of Herodes as the eastern end is by the Theatre of Dionysus, and so it is useless to look for any early buildings in this region.

The bold mass of rock that forms the Areopagus stands up on the right as one descends from the Acropolis, and rises in a steep cliff; on the farther side it slopes gently toward the Pnyx. That its existence was to some extent a menace to the Acropolis as a fortress is recognised in the tale of the Amazons,

who established themselves here when they attacked Theseus; but the word *ἀντεπύργωσαν*, used by Æschylus in this context, is not probably to be taken as referring to any traces or tradition of a fortification of the Areopagus; its natural strength suffices, especially on the side toward the Acropolis, which is inaccessible but for a narrow flight of steps cut in the rock. Herodo-



POLYGONAL WALLS OF CISTERN.
Near Asclepieum.

tus tells us that it was also occupied by the Persians when attacking the defenders of the Acropolis. The chief interest of the hill is, however, religious rather than military. There are various traditions about the origin of the name, which ancient authors all associate with the name of Ares. The commonest version states that Ares was tried there after the murder of Halirrhothius; Æschylus rejects this version and preserves the solemnity of the trial of Orestes as the proto-


type of all murder trials by saying that the Amazons sacrificed to Ares, and so the name arose. There was a temple of Ares situated near it, probably near its northern slope. It also contained an altar of Athena Areia, said to have been dedicated by Orestes; and there seems no sufficient reason for giving up the traditional interpretation, Mars' Hill, and substituting, as is suggested by some modern mythologists, Hill of Curses (Ἀραί).¹ The top of the hill was in early times the seat of the famous Court of Areopagus, but little is left to show the arrangements. There is a roughly levelled platform and some cuttings in the rock; but it is impossible to identify with certainty even the Stone of Violence or the Stone of Ruthlessness (λίθος Ὑβρεως, λίθος Ἀναιδείας), on which the accused and the accuser took their stand at a trial for manslaughter.

At the end toward the Acropolis is a deep cleft, between the hill itself and a high piece of rock that has broken off from it. This is the place that must be identified as the shrine of the Holy Ones, the Σεμναί, as the Athenians called them, where they took up their abode, as Æschylus tells in the *Eumenides*, when Athena had appeased their wrath at the homicide's escape. It may be doubted whether the cleft remains as in ancient time, or the piece of rock has fallen since and engulfed the altars and the rest of the sanctuary. But in any case we may probably trace a connection such as that insisted upon by Æschylus between the

¹ See Frazer, *Paus.* II. 363.



THE AREOPAGUS AND THE OBSERVATORY HILL.
Behind, Ægaleos, and, to the right, pass of Daphne.



august court upon the hill, which claimed to be the first established in the world for the judgment of homicide, and the "wild justice" of revenge and blood feud which it superseded, and which was represented by the Erinyes in the cleft below. Close by the shrine of the Semnæ was the Cylonion, erected, probably, when the city was purified by Epimenides, on the spot where the followers of the rash pretender had been massacred, vainly trusting in the rope that connected them with their sanctuary in the Old Temple of Athena on the Acropolis.

After the Acropolis itself, the most conspicuous monument of pre-Persian Athens is the Pnyx. It lies just beyond the Areopagus, and appears just above it in the view from the Propylæa. In the slope of the hill facing the Acropolis is a scarped face of rock, not straight, but consisting of two equal portions meeting at an obtuse angle; and where they meet is a square block, like an altar, approached by steps, all cut in the living rock. Below the scarp is a semicircular area, retained at its outer edge by a wall of huge blocks, partly squared, partly polygonal. At either side, where the ends of this semicircular retaining wall abut against the face of rock, they are considerably higher than the foot of the square block; but in the middle several of the upper courses have given way, and consequently the area retained by the wall now slopes downward from the face of rock. If, however, we imagine the retaining wall of the same height throughout the whole semicircle, we must restore the area which it contained as sloping

down from the circumference toward the centre, like a rather shallow theatre. Such a form would be admirably adapted for a place of popular assembly, and there can be little doubt that it is rightly identified as the Pnyx, though, like almost all other matters in Athenian topography, the identification has been disputed. Curtius



THE PNYX, FROM THE AREOPAGUS.
Salamis behind.

sees in it merely a place of sacrifice with a rock-cut altar in the midst, and, to confirm his view, quotes certain dedications to Zeus Ἰψιστος found in the immediate neighbourhood. But in that case the massive supporting wall would be superfluous; no one is likely to have taken the trouble to terrace up this great semicircular area merely to accommodate those assisting at a sacrifice,

It seems far more probable that this structure is the Pnyx, the earliest place in which a democratic assembly of citizens was ever held. It would be interesting if we could date with any degree of precision the time when it was made. The style of the masonry does not give any certain clue; the great size of the blocks at



BEMA AND ROCK-CUT WALL OF PNYX.

first sight suggests a very early date; the largest blocks are about 9 ft. 6 by 7 ft. 6 in the face, and 6 feet in depth. But this massive construction was necessitated by the weight of earth which the wall had to support; the beds are horizontal, and many of the joints are vertical, and the general nature of the construction suggests the sixth or even the fifth century rather than any prehistoric epoch; the age either of Solon or of Clisthenes

would suit well enough, and so great a work, undertaken for such a purpose, must most naturally be associated with some chief epoch in the approach to democracy. It may well be that the scarped rock and the square altar in the midst of it go back to an earlier age, and may even have served, as Curtius suggests, for the altar of Zeus Ἱψιστος. There is nothing repugnant to Greek notions in mounting an altar to address the crowd, especially when we remember that the meeting of the Ecclesia was a sacred function, inheriting even such primitive regulations as the necessity for dismissing the people if a drop of rain fell.¹ If the square block is the famous Bema (ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐν τῇ πυκνί, as Aristophanes calls it²), from which the orators of Athens addressed the people, it is impossible to give a literal interpretation to Plutarch's statement³ that the Bema had originally faced the sea, and that the Thirty Tyrants turned it so as to face the land. It is, however, extremely difficult to explain this passage in any case; for the orators must have faced their audience, and the change referred to would imply a reconstruction of the whole of the Pnyx. Most probably Plutarch has misunderstood his authority and given a literal meaning to what was originally a purely metaphorical statement, that the Thirty, reverting to the tradition of the earlier tyrants, turned the eyes of the leaders of Athenian policy away from the sea, of which the command had been the chief object of the Athenian democracy since the days of Themistocles.

¹ Ar. *Ach.* 169.² Ar. *Pax*, 680.³ *Themist.* 19.

It is true that there is an oblong terrace of levelled rock above the scarped face, which would hold a considerable number of people, and toward which an orator on the Bema would look if he faced seaward; but the sea could never have been visible either from the Bema or from the levelled area near it, especially when the city wall was standing along the ridge of the hill; Aristophanes' line¹ about Cleon, ἀπὸ τῶν πετρῶν ἄνωθεν τοὺς φόρους θυννοσκοπῶν cannot refer to the actual view from the place of assembly, though the hill just above it would make an excellent post of observation. In another passage in the same play² the sausage-seller upbraids Cleon for having left the Demos to be content with a hard seat on the rocks, and offers a cushion to give him more comfort. If pressed in its literal signification, this expression might seem to imply rock-cut seats; but there can be no question of anything of the sort if the Pnyx is rightly identified; and so we must probably interpret αἱ πέτραι as applying to the whole rocky region—the hill from which Cleon also looked out for the tribute ships—rather than as describing the actual seats themselves. How the semi-circular area was seated we cannot say; but the passage in Aristophanes shows, in the first place, that the people did sit down, and in the second place, that they can hardly have had wooden benches.

The valley between the Acropolis, the Pnyx, and the Areopagus is much better known to us than any other

¹ *Eg.* 312.

² *L.* 783, ἐπὶ ταῖσι πέτραις . . . σκληρῶς σε καθήμενον οὕτως.



district of early Athens, thanks to the systematic excavations that have been made there by Professor Dörpfeld. The main object of these excavations was to settle, if possible, the disputed points of Athenian topography that depend on the position of the fountain Enneacrunus. They have, as was hoped, brought to light a most interesting series of waterworks, including rock cuttings to collect the scanty supply of spring water from the hill of the Pnyx, many wells in the lower and more level ground, a series of larger and smaller drains, of various periods, and, above all, the end of an aqueduct which must be assigned to the time of Pisistratus.¹ But, in addition to all this, they have laid bare what must have been one of the most thickly populated regions of the town, with its streets, houses, sacred precincts, and temples.

The chief road found in these excavations leads through the depression between the Pnyx and the Areopagus, and extends for about 250 yards in a southerly direction, just to the east of the modern road and nearly parallel to it. Then roads branch off from it to the south and west ; but the main track takes a broad sweep to the east, and begins to mount the steep ascent of the Acropolis almost on the line of the modern zig-zag road, after sending off another branch following the line of the modern road along the south side of the Acropolis. Just opposite the gate of the Acropolis a foot-path branches off, leading directly up the hill, and

¹ See Chapter I. Note a, Water Supply.

EXCAVATION W. OF ACROPOLIS.

after Dörpfeld & Wilberg.



264 22 932

zags of the road. The road is sides by early walls, some polygonal, or less squared blocks. Whether of houses or merely enclosures for open spaces, they are all evidently of lower courses, though many of them for a superstructure of later period. Doubt, then, that we here see one of



EXCAVATIONS WEST OF ACROPOLIS.

Looking along road. Precinct and wine-press on left, houses on right.

orter route between the Areopagus

To our notion, the street seems age width must have been the same twelve to fifteen feet, and may typical of such parts of an ancient laid out in a sumptuous manner and ample spaces. We have to ng or riding in the streets of the viduals was very unusual, probably

unknown except when a man was starting on a journey. It is true that such narrow streets offer little room for the passage of a great procession such as that of the Panathenæa, or the gallop of the knights from the Hermæ in the Agora to the Eleusinium.¹ Spectacular effects and the presence of any considerable number of spectators would have to be restricted to the more open parts of the route, if this road was the one along which they passed.

In the angle between this street and the southern side of the Areopagus is a triangular enclosure, bordered on one side by the main street, on the other two by branch roads that communicate with the street. This enclosure is surrounded by an early wall, and was clear of houses. In the apex of the triangle, which faced to the south, was a partition, shutting off a small temple which was probably entered from the south. The rest of the triangle was open, but for an altar in its midst and a wine-press in its north-western corner, both of which deserve careful attention. The altar was of the shape of a table, carried on four legs, for which the sockets can still be seen in the basis, which is the only portion that survives. In this basis are also grooves for receiving two stelæ. The wine-press shows traces of several successive reconstructions, with its floor at different levels, and it also has a large vessel sunk into the ground to receive the must as it flowed from the treading of the grapes. The wine-press and the peculiar form of the altar suggest that the

¹ Xen. *Hipparch.* III. 2.

temple and precinct were dedicated to Dionysus, an inference confirmed by the fact that in Roman times, after the original shrine had been buried and forgotten, a hall was built over part of its site for the sacred feasts of the Iobacchi, a religious club that may have preserved the tradition of the early ritual. A precinct that occupies a central position in a populous quarter of the city challenges identification; and Professor Dörpfeld confidently claims that he has found the long-sought Dionysium in the Marshes, which he was also inclined to identify with the Lenæum, the "place of the wine-press,"¹ quoting the wine-press still to be seen in the



EARLY PRECINCT OF DIONYSUS.

Later house in front; hall of Iobacchi above; behind it, Areopagus.

corner of the precinct. He has, however, seen reason to give up this latter identification, tempting as it is. The Lenæum cannot well be identical with the Dionysium in the Marshes, which was open only on one day in the year, in the month of Anthesterion; for the Lenæa, the *ἀγὼν ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ*, was celebrated at the Lenæum in the month of Gamelion; and, moreover, there

¹ I give the customary explanation, though there is much force in Mr. L. R. Farnell's argument that *Ἀθηναίων* must come from *Ἀθηναί*, not *Ἀθηνας*. *Classical Review*.

would be no room in so small a precinct for the crowd which would gather to attend this popular festival and to see the theatrical performances that accompanied it. Above all, we know from an inscription¹ that the festival of the Lenæa was still celebrated as late as 192 A.D., when this early precinct was buried and the Hall of the Iobacchi built above its ruins. With the Dionysium in the Marshes the case is not so simple. The only clue that we possess as to the position of this temple, apart from its title, is the much-disputed passage in Thucydides II. 15;² and though I hold, in common with the majority of interpreters, that the argument of Thucydides is stultified, unless the temples mentioned in this passage lie to the south of the Acropolis, Professor Dörpfeld and those who hold with him upon this question do not admit the inference. As to the situation of the quarter named the Marshes (Λίμναι), it is notoriously dangerous to argue about the names of natural features when retained in the middle of a town,³ and I think it would be wiser to leave this consideration out of the question. But, if it is to be brought in, I think it is easier to suppose that a marsh existed between the theatre and the Ilissus, where we know there was a great ditch, presumably for drainage, and containing mud worth carrying away, than on the arid watershed

¹ *CIA*. III. 1160, quoted by Frazer, V. 498.

² See Note IV *a*.

³ The case of Market Hill in Cambridge, which is absolutely level, and in the middle of a flat region, is a good example. No topographer who went by names would admit its identification.

between the Acropolis and the Pnyx.¹ The argument in favour of the precinct being the Dionysium in the Marshes, apart from the topographical question, amounts to little more than this — that it is evidently a very early shrine of Dionysus, and that Thucydides says the temple in the Marshes was the one in which the earlier Dionysia were celebrated; such an argument, though good as far as it goes, is evidently insufficient in itself, for there were probably many early precincts of Dionysus in Athens, belonging to the various early settlements; there must, for example, have been one in Kollytos, where the country Dionysia were celebrated;² why should not this have been a corresponding local shrine in Melite? It seems extremely improbable that a sacred precinct of such importance as that of Dionysus in the Marshes, where the most primitive and most solemn festival of the Anthesteria was held, — a festival that was essential to the state religion, and in which the Queen, the wife of the magistrate called the King, took the most prominent part,³ — should have been forgotten and buried before the second century of our era.

¹ The Hero Calamites, who used to come into this argument as near the Lenæum, disappears from the controversy, if the identity of Lenæum and Dionysium in the Marshes is given up.

² Dem. *de Cor.* 180; Æschin. I. 157.

³ The stela with the oath the βασιλίσσα administered to the γερῶται, which was set up beside the altar of the Dionysium in the Marshes, has been associated with the sockets for a stela found on the altar in this precinct. But such things are common enough. There is more in the suggestion that the Iobaccheia, which the γερῶται promise to perform duly, were perpetuated in the rites of the Iobacchi on the same spot. The two, however, cannot be identical; for the one is a state ceremony, the other a private one: and, moreover, the Iobaccheia are not among the festivals which the Iobacchi celebrate, and of which we have a complete list. It seems, then, that this is no more than an accidental coincidence.

On the other side of the main road, opposite the triangular precinct, was a quaint little shrine, temple and altar and precinct all complete, yet all contained within an area of about twenty-five feet by fifteen — the temple itself a mere rectangular cell, some 6 feet by 5. There is no clue as to the deity to whom the shrine was dedicated; very likely such small precincts were set aside in many of the streets of an ancient town, just as one sees small shrines beside the road, both in town and country, anywhere in southern Europe, at the present day. The little precinct was buried and forgotten before the fourth century, when a club-house was built over it.

Of the houses of this early period little can be said, for nothing is left but the lower courses of their outer walls. Farther along the road, opposite the foot-path leading up to the Acropolis, there are no remains of early houses between the road and the Pnyx hill; indeed, there appears to have been a fairly extensive open space here, estimated by Professor Dörpfeld at about 40 metres by 20 (130 ft. by 65 ft.). Here was the well-house at the end of the aqueduct, constructed in all probability by Pisistratus¹; some stones have actually been found with water channels cut in them, and others with sockets in which to rest the pitchers as they were being filled. This comparatively spacious place must have been the centre of civic life in this district, situated as it was by the fountain, and immediately below the

¹ See Chapter I a.

entrance to the Acropolis; and with the streets, houses, and temples that surround it, it enables us for the first time to realise in imagination what one of the most populous districts of ancient Athens must have looked like in the time before the Persian Wars. Opposite the open space, in the corner between the main road and the path to the Acropolis, lay another sacred precinct. In later times this was dedicated to Asclepius and Amynos; but if, as we have seen in the case of the better-known Asclepieum, the worship of Asclepius was not introduced into Athens until 420 B.C., we must suppose that he was adopted later to share an early shrine of healing dedicated to the Attic hero, Amynos. Little is left of early date except the surrounding walls of the precinct, and perhaps a small chapel of Amynos; the propylæa at the corner and all the dedications belong to the later history of the precinct.

Beyond this precinct, in the loop between the road and the beginning of the ascent to the Acropolis, nothing has been found except some graves of Mycenaean period or slightly later. There is little even of negative evidence, for there is so shallow an accumulation of earth above the native rock that it is not to be expected that much would survive. There are indeed no foundations of houses; but there are no foundations of temples either, nor have any traces been found of the dedications which could hardly have failed to have left some fragments behind them, if this had been an important sanctuary. The facts are the more dis-

appointing as this is the place which Professor Dörpfeld assigns to the Eleusinium below the Acropolis; and if we could assert with confidence either that it was here or that it could not have been here, we should have valuable evidence either to corroborate or to disprove his system of Athenian topography. As it is, the position of the Eleusinium must still be regarded as uncertain; it depends entirely upon general considerations of topography such as we are not at present concerned with.¹

To the north of the Acropolis, where the town of mediæval and modern Athens is situated, there are practically no ancient remains except of Hellenistic and Roman date. In view of the extreme cost and difficulty of excavations in this region, we shall probably have to be content for some time to come with such inferences as the conformation of the ground and the allusions in ancient authors will allow in any attempt to realise what buildings and what quarters of the early Greek city occupied this region. It is not until we come to the south-east of the Acropolis that we find any monuments of early date; here, above the valley of the Ilissus, is a collection of early temples and sacred objects to which especial honour was given by the Tyrants, but which, some of them at least, must preserve the traditions of an earlier age. Chief among them is the Olympieum, a building which ranked among the seven wonders of the world, and of

¹ See discussion below, Note XIII a.



THE OLYMPIEUM AND STADIUM FROM THE ACROPOLIS.

Above, Hymettus.

which we know the architectural history from literary sources with an exceptional amount of completeness and certainty. But at present we are not concerned with its later glories, nor with the erection of the huge columns that are still among the most conspicuous monuments of modern Athens. Before Pisistratus began the great temple that was to remain unfinished until the time of Hadrian, there must have been some earlier building on this spot. Mr. Penrose's excavations in 1885 showed, underneath the foundations of Pisistratus' work, other walls at a slightly different angle, which he assigns to the earlier temple traditionally said to have been built by Deucalion. Here also was a smaller precinct dedicated

to Ge Olympia, and in this was shown the cleft by which the waters of Deucalion's flood were said to have been swallowed; it was about eighteen inches wide, and every year cakes of wheaten meal kneaded with honey were thrown into it. The tomb of Deucalion was to be seen in the neighbourhood. All these things have a primitive character, and it can hardly be doubted that there was in this region from the earliest times a collection of sacred objects, including some that are natural in origin. It is, however, probable enough that the name Olympieum and the epithet "Olympian," attached to both Zeus and Earth, are a later modification. Such a change would well accord with the Panhellenic tendencies of Pisistratus and his contemporaries, and the consequent organisation of Greek religion and general recognition of the Olympian cult. There was also a temple of Cronos and Rhea, which may belong to the same age. However this may be, the temple of Olympian Zeus, as begun by Pisistratus, was on a most magnificent scale. Although its plan cannot be completely recovered, the remains of its walls and pavement show that it had an orientation slightly different from that of the later temple, and that the cella was, by Mr. Penrose's estimate, 116 feet long and 50 feet wide—considerably larger than that of the Parthenon. It was of the Doric order, and the immense size of its columns may be judged from the unfluted drums belonging to it that have been used as a foundation for the

present Corinthian columns or built into other structures in the neighbourhood. One of these is not less than 7 feet 10 inches in diameter;¹ it is made of Piraic limestone. It is impossible to judge how far toward completion the building had advanced before the expulsion of the Tyrants put an end to its progress; but it remained all through the great age of Athens in an unfinished state. Perhaps, just as the blackened ruins of the temples sacked by the Persians were left to perpetuate resentment and to incite vengeance, so the monumental record of this ambitious and abortive scheme was intended to serve as a warning against the presumption of tyrants; but to it, as well as to the later temple begun on the same site in Hellenistic times, might be applied the words of Livy, "Unum in terris inchoatum pro magnitudine dei."

The Pythium, which lay close to the Olympieum beside the Ilissus, is also said to have been built by Pisistratus. Its exact position is not known, but several inscriptions once set up in it have been found by the river, just to the south-west of the Olympieum, and so this is generally recognised as its probable situation. The honour paid to it by the Tyrants is attested by the inscription, on an altar, quoted by Thucydides,² which has actually been found on this spot:—

¹ Penrose, *J.H.S.* VIII. 273. Those of the Parthenon are about 6 feet 3 inches at the bottom; those of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (the largest extant Greek columns known), 7 feet 3 inches.

² Curiously enough, Thucydides says ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασι, while the inscription is now perfectly clear; the explanation may be that the colour originally put in the letters had faded.

μνήμα τόδ' ἦς ἀρχῆς Πεισίστρατος Ἰππίου υἱὸς
θῆκεν Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθίου ἐν τεμένει.

This Pisistratus is the grandson of the Tyrant. There is not here, as in the case of the Olympieum, any evidence that the temple built by Pisistratus was on the site of an older sanctuary.

Just below the Olympieum the bed of the Ilissus is crossed by a shelf of rock, over which the river forms a cascade when it is in flood; and in the shelf of rock is a spring, now scanty, but never dry, which is traditionally identified as the famous Callirrhoe; the modern usage goes back at least to the time of Wheler; and his testimony in this matter is the more valuable, because he realised the difficulty of explaining the route of Pausanias, and even inclined to explain the name as a mere coincidence. Whether this is the same Callirrhoe that was furnished with an ornamental fountain by the Tyrants, and then called Enneacrunus, is a difficult and disputed question, and is discussed elsewhere.¹ But here we may notice its proximity to the buildings which we know to have been begun by Pisistratus, and the consequent probability of his having built a fountain here, as well as the aqueduct that led to the space in front of the gates of the Acropolis.

Just across the river was the suburb of Agræ, famous for the celebration of the Lesser Mysteries. Whether these mysteries existed before the adoption of Eleusis and its rites into the cycle of Athenian state religion is

¹ See I a. pp. 18-21, and also Note XIII a (Pausanias).

a doubtful matter; but after that adoption, the Lesser Mysteries at Agræ had to be attended in the spring, as a necessary qualification before proceeding to the first stage of initiation at Eleusis the following autumn. They must have been held in a temple of Demeter in this region, to be distinguished from the Eleusinia below



STADIUM (BEFORE RECENT RESTORATION), AND MODERN BRIDGE OVER ILISSUS.

the Acropolis. A little farther on was the Stadium, where the Panathenaic games were held; this was originally a natural valley, and we have no information as to when it received its present shape; but it is hardly rash to conjecture that Pisistratus, who added greatly to the prestige of the Panathenæa, and raised them to an almost Panhellenic importance, must have provided

them with a stadium corresponding to their pretensions, if the one already existing at Athens had not yet been altered from its primitive simplicity.

Another temple that must be assigned to the time before the Persian Wars, and probably to Pisistratus, is that of Dionysus, just below the theatre — not, of course, the larger one, of which the conglomerate foundations are conspicuous, but the smaller one, of which only a corner now remains, encroaching on the step of the long portico that backs the scene of Lycurgus. This corner, however, shows the characteristic material, Kará stone, which, so far as we know, was only used in the age of Pisistratus; and the character of the work and the clamps used also suit the sixth century. This must be the temple of Dionysus Eleuthereus, in which his early wooden image was housed, and from which it was taken on its annual journey to the Academy and back. Tradition said that the statue was brought from Eleutheræ on the borders of Attica and Bœotia, to Athens by a certain Pegasus, whose action was approved by the Delphic oracle; we know nothing further of this matter, but it is generally regarded as part of the general concentration of the chief Attic cults in Athens itself. Close to the temple there exist, beneath the later stage buildings, the remains of a circle of very primitive structure, partly of Acropolis rock, partly of the soft sandstone that underlies it. This circle was first recognised by Professor Dörpfeld as the primitive orchestra or dancing place, where the dances took place in honour

of Dionysus. To judge from the material, it probably goes back to a very early time; possibly it was an early threshing-floor utilised for the purpose; such threshing-floors suggest orchestras at the present day, when one sees them near a Greek town or village; and we know that at Delphi the place where the sacred drama of the fight of Apollo and the Python was periodically performed was called the threshing-floor. Choric dances in honour of Dionysus are of course far earlier than the dramatic performances which, to some extent, but never entirely, superseded them. The earliest dramatic performances in Athens are said to have been given, not here, but in the Agora or the Lenæum. This temple of Dionysus Eleuthereus cannot be identical with the temple of Dionysus in the Marshes; for the latter was open only one day in the year, at the Anthesteria,¹ while the Theatre of Dionysus and the precinct to which it is attached must have been open at least at the great Dionysia, and later, also, whenever there was a public assembly in the Theatre. And, moreover, Thucydides' intention, when he mentions among the early temples to the south of the Acropolis the Dionysium in the Marshes, defining it as the one where they celebrate the more primitive Dionysia in the month Anthesterion, can only be to distinguish it from the more familiar precinct below the Theatre. As to the exact position of the Dionysium in the Marshes we have no further clue;

¹ Dem. LIX, 76: ἀπαξ γὰρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκάστου ἀνοίγεται, τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος μηνός.

there are, as we have seen, serious objections to identifying it with the precinct recently discovered by Professor Dörpfeld below the Areopagus. It has been thought that the third important temple of Dionysus in Athens, the Lenæum, or "Place of the Wine-press," may have been identical with either or both of the other two. But there is really no reason to doubt its independent existence; the title of the festival held there, *ὁ ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ ἀγών*, seems to imply that it was a separate precinct. The Lenæum is of peculiar interest for the period preceding the Persian Wars; for it was at the festival of the Lenæa that dramatic performances were first introduced, and it is generally supposed that the Great, or City Dionysia,¹ which were held in later times in the theatre above the precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus, and at which most of the plays we possess were first performed, were not instituted until after the Persian Wars.² It would be very interesting if we could identify with any degree of probability the place where the earliest dramas were performed; but there is no clue to the exact position of the Lenæum, unless we attempt to reconcile the two alternative statements already quoted, that the first plays were performed either in the Agora or the Lenæum, by the supposition that the Lenæum was in or near the Agora. The explanations given by lexicographers of the proverb, *ἀπ' αἰγείρου θέα*, tell of a scaffolding with seats, built for the dramatic performances before the theatre was

¹ *Τὰ μεγάλα* or *τὰ ἐν δορεῖ*.

² See Müller, *Bühnenaltertümer*, p. 310.

made, and reaching to a poplar whence the most distant spectators could see; and such a poplar is said to have existed in the Agora. However, even if this hypothesis be granted, we should not have gained much until we had ascertained where the early Agora was, and this is another most difficult problem. In the whole question of these various Dionysia, the views here given appear to be the most probable inferences from the existing data; but it must be admitted that these data are inadequate, and to some extent contradictory, and that new discoveries may necessitate a revision of some of the conclusions.

After this survey of the buildings earlier than the Persian Wars of which we can either ascertain or conjecture the situation, we must return to the more general question from which we started, and ask what, in all probability, were the general characteristics of the town, and where was the chief centre of civic life.

It is probable, as we have seen, that the various villages around the Acropolis had each its own local shrines and even, perhaps, its local market-place. But after the concentration had taken place, there must have been an Agora and a set of public buildings recognised as belonging, not to one town alone, but to all the citizens scattered throughout Attica. The religious centre remained in the Acropolis; but the centre of civic life and civic worship in a Greek city, as soon as it leaves the palace of the king, usually centres about the hearth of the state; and this is repre-

sented by the Tholus, where the Prytanes sacrificed, and the Prytaneum, or centre of official life. We know approximately where these buildings were in later times; the Prytaneum was not far from the sanctuary of Aglauros, below the north slope of the Acropolis, and the Tholus was near the upper end of the Agora. The two are not likely to have been far from one another.¹ The Tholus in any case was the place where the hospitality of the city was dispensed. Beside it was the Buleuterium or Senate-house. So long as the Tholus and Prytaneum were in this position, we must imagine the Agora also as lying to the north of the Areopagus and to the north-west of the Acropolis. Indeed, Professor Curtius, who places the earliest Agora to the south of the Acropolis, has to place the earliest Prytaneum there also. But such a shifting of the pivots of public and official life is in the highest degree improbable; nor does the statement of Thucydides justify the assumption. Thucydides, it is true, says that the earliest city so far as it lay outside the Acropolis, lay mainly to the south; but it is the position of early temples, not of early municipal buildings, that he quotes in support of the statement; nor could he have failed to quote evidence so convincing, if he had had any knowledge of an earlier Prytaneum to the south of the Acropolis. The common Prytaneum and Buleuterium, of which Thucydides attributes the foun-

¹ When the Scholiast, in *Ar. Pax*, 1153, says they were side by side, he probably confuses Prytaneum and Buleuterium.

dation to Theseus, are evidently those which continued to exist throughout historical times in Athens. Before the time of Theseus, who had come to be regarded by the Athenians as the champion and founder of the democracy, there is perhaps no need to look for public buildings other than the palace of the king and the temples of the gods. We may, then, assert with some confidence that the earliest civic life of Athens, and with it the Agora, must have lain to the north-west of the Acropolis; but it is by no means so easy to determine the exact position and extent of the Agora at this or at any time in the history of the town. We should naturally expect it to be a more or less level area, lying between the Dipylon Gate and the Acropolis. Processions starting from the Dipylon doubtless came to it; but whether they passed through it to the upper end, or circled round it and then went out the way they came and on by another route, is by no means certain.¹ A space that suits the required conditions may be found in the depression that lies to the east of the Theseum, and to the north of the gap between the Areopagus and the Acropolis; and this has the advantage of not being too far away from the Prytaneum. An alternative view is, that the Agora was not so much an open square as a continuous market street, which stretched away from near the Theseum to just below the Pnyx. As most of our evidence about the Agora belongs to the succeeding periods, we must

¹ See p. 133.

leave most of these questions for the present; but there is one, perhaps the most decisive of all, with which we are now concerned. After the expulsion of the Tyrants, the Athenians set up statues to Harmodius and Aristogiton, who had slain Hipparchus, as the representative heroes of the new freedom. It is true that the statues




SITE OF AGORA FROM ACROPOLIS.

Pnyx, Areopagus, Theseum. Beyond them, olive groves beside Cephissus. Above, Ægaleos and Pass of Daphne.

were taken away by Xerxes; but they were replaced by other statues, and the original ones also were restored at a later date. Probably the place assigned to these statues, which was reserved for them alone, was the same from the first; and we are told by Arrian that it was beside the ascent to the Acropolis, and opposite the



THE TYRANNICIDES, HARMODIUS AND ARISTOGITON.



Metroum, which we know to have adjoined the Buleuterium. They were therefore at the upper or southern end of the Agora; and if we could decide what is meant by the ascent to the Acropolis, we should know approximately where this end, at least, of the Agora must be placed. Earlier topographers, taking the ascent to mean the immediate approach to the Propylæa, placed the statues of the Tyrannicides just below this. But it is incredible that the Agora can have extended to the south of the Areopagus: it would in that case lose all unity and character, and be quite unsuited to its purpose. We are therefore reduced to two alternatives: the ascent to the Acropolis at the upper end of the Agora must either mean the rather steep way up to the saddle between the Areopagus and the Acropolis, or the gentler acclivity between the Areopagus and the Pnyx. The former position seems more probable, for various reasons. In the first place I do not think the words, *ἡ ἀνιμεν ἐς πόλιν*, "*the way by which we ascend to the Acropolis*," is at all a natural or even intelligible description of the road that runs along the foot of the Pnyx Hill, as viewed from the space to the north of the Areopagus. It has only a gentle slope¹ and it does not lead directly to the Acropolis at all; a branch, indeed, zigzags off from it to the Acropolis just as from the modern carriage road, as it approaches the Odeum of Herodes; but the more direct road leads to the Itonian Gate on one side, to the Theatre of Dionysus on the

¹ The modern road along the same line has a slope of about one in twenty.



SITE OF AGORA FROM NEAR THESEUM.

Above, Acropolis and Areopagus, and path up to saddle between them.

other. Nobody at the present day, who found himself to the north of the Areopagus, would think of describing the passage to the west of it as the ascent to the Acropolis, or of going round that way to the Acropolis if on foot. The ascent between the Areopagus and the Acropolis is indeed a steep one, and unsuitable for carriages; but it is not so steep as the ascent immediately below the Propylæa; nor is there any reason for supposing that a carriage road went by it. For carriages and for processions with unwieldy vehicles, the more circuitous route is doubtless preferable; and if we must imagine that such processions usually passed through the Agora and out at its upper end, then they most probably did go by the road under the Pnyx Hill. Even then, however, Arrian's expression, *ἡ ἀνίμεν*, could still more naturally refer to the ordinary, not the processional, route; the existence of the two ways is to some extent confirmed by the passage in the epistle attributed to Diogenes,¹ describing the two

¹ No. 30.



SITE OF AGORA FROM NEAR THESEUM.

Above, Areopagus, Museum, and Pnyx Hill, and road between them.

roads leading up to the Acropolis, one short and steep, the other long and gently sloping; but it is more likely that this refers to a short cut at the final ascent, for it is only pointed out on a near approach to the Acropolis. It is, moreover, possible that the Panathenaic processions, after circling round the Agora, left it again at the point at which they entered, and went round another way,—perhaps below the east end of the Acropolis,—so making an almost complete circuit of the city. There is, indeed, some evidence in favour of this route. And, if so, there is no reason left for regarding the ascent from Agora to Acropolis as passing to the west rather than to the east of the Areopagus. This discussion has involved some anticipation of matters that really belong to a later period, and has led us into something of a digression. But it is of essential importance to our notion as to the position of the most central parts of the early as well as of the later town. If we suppose the Agora

to lie just north of the gap between Areopagus and Acropolis, another great advantage is gained in the comparative proximity of the Prytaneum below the precinct of Aglauros to the Buleuterium and Tholos, which are so closely associated with it both in history and in daily life and ritual. It is even more difficult to accept a scheme of topography which involves a considerable distance between these buildings for the early town than for the later; and according to the theory which makes the Agora extend up to the foot of the Pnyx, they would be separated, not only by a linear distance of over five hundred yards, but also by a great part of the rocky mass of the Areopagus.

Assuming then as probable, if not certain, the results of this investigation, let us attempt to form some general notion of the lower town of Athens, as it was in the time between the expulsion of the Tyrants and the Persian Wars. And it will be convenient to begin at the same place at which we shall have to begin also our visit to the city with Pausanias, some 650 years later. But before we enter the city, it will be well to take a more comprehensive survey, such as one may have from the top of Lycabettus. The view from such a height as this makes one realise the meaning of the picturesque expression of the Delphic oracle, πόλις τροχαιδέος ἄκρα κάρηνα. The city, surrounded by its wall, is just like a wheel, with the Acropolis standing up like a huge nave in the middle of it, its shapeless mass still showing the uncouth strength of walls like

those of Tiryns or Mycenæ. Away to the left, outside the town walls, is the vast but unfinished structure of the Olympieum, and beside it the Pythium, another work of the Tyrants. Beyond the city the peninsula of the Piræus is as yet nothing more than a quarry, with a small fort on Munychia, built by Hippias,—but built to secure his own escape rather than as the beginning of the splendid fortified harbours that are soon to be devised by Themistocles. Farther away on the right is Salamis, already colonised by Athenian settlers, but still awaiting the battle predicted by the same Delphic response that has just been quoted, which will make it a household word; and, in the middle of the Saronic Gulf, Ægina, “the eyesore of the Piræus,” the home of some of the most formidable rivals of the Athenians in art as well as in commercial and naval supremacy—rivals for another fifty years, until they are driven out to seek a new home, and their places are taken by colonists from Athens. The forms of the mountains are the same in all ages; but Pentelicus does not yet show the white scar of the quarries from which the architecture and the sculpture of Athens are to draw their material. The course of the Cephissus is marked by the broad band of olive groves that supply a great part of the wealth of the town, and through them passes the Sacred Way to Eleusis, which is already rising to eminence among the national shrines of Greece, though not yet enjoying the recognised preëminence of a later age. Between the olive groves and the town

the Sacred Way passes through the Potters' Quarter, the Ceramicus, which is divided by the town wall into an inner and an outer portion. Here the potters' workshops are already at the highest point of their commercial activity and of their artistic skill. The vases made of the beautiful red clay of the Ceramicus, and painted by a band of artists who can never be surpassed in delicacy and precision of line drawing and in beauty of decorative effect, are already famous throughout Greek lands, and even beyond. The tombs of Italy will preserve them in great numbers to fill the museums of Europe. The quaint and stiff black-figured work has already made way for the finer red-figured technique; and among the potters and painters who may be seen at work are men like Euphronius, Brygos, and Hieron, whose fame as artists will be far greater twenty-four centuries after their death than it is in their lifetime. For they are mere artificers, many of them at the head of large manufactories with numerous assistants; and though doubtless the city may take some pride in the great foreign demand for their work, its extreme beauty is taken as a matter of course, though it really is in advance of the time.

Let us now leave our point of survey on the top of Lycabettus, and begin our passage through the city from the Potters' Quarter. Between the Outer and the Inner Ceramicus we pass through a gate which is the chief gate of the city; for through it passes the Sacred Way to Eleusis, which is also the highroad

to the rest of continental Greece. Here too the Panathenaic procession, greatly increased in magnificence under the Tyrants, is marshalled before it starts its progress through the town. It was through this gate that the tyrant-slayers, Harmodius and Aristogiton, rushed out to kill Hipparchus, who was supervising the preparations; we shall see their statues later on, where they have recently been set up at the top of the Agora. Within the gate is a street lined with booths and stalls for the sale of various goods, leading to the lower end of the Agora. The Agora itself is not a regular square surrounded by colonnades such as has come into fashion in the rich cities of Ionia, but a more or less irregular space, above which we can see, rising high up on the left, the cliffs and walls of the Acropolis, and, immediately in front, the lower rock of the Areopagus. Around it are buildings for the resort of the citizens and for the transaction of public business; near the top on the right, the Buleuterium, founded by Theseus when he first made Athens into the central city of Attica, but now the home of the new senate of five hundred organised by Clisthenes; near it is the Tholus, the sacred hearth of the state, where the sacrifices are regularly made by the officials of the day; a little way off to the left, below the slope of the Acropolis and the cave of Aglauros, is the Prytaneum, where the officials are housed and hold their frugal banquets. Close to it is the temple of the Dioscuri, where Pisistratus assembled the people together in arms, and then, having

enticed them away, had all their arms collected and carried into the sanctuary of Aglauros just above. The open space of the Agora leads at the top to a kind of platform on the side of the hill; this place is called the Orchestra, and its associations for us are most interesting. Here, when a rude scaffolding has been erected that reaches to the poplar trees surrounding the open space, the first plays of the famous Attic drama are performed at the festival of the Lenæa; for the great theatre is not yet built, nor do plays yet form any part of the festival held in the precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus to the south of the Acropolis, although there is an early orchestra there also for the choruses to dance on in honour of the god. Here too, beside the ascent to the Acropolis, are set up the statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton, who slew the Tyrant Hipparchus, and have now come to be counted as the heroes and champions of freedom. The statues are by Antenor,¹ one of the greatest of Attic sculptors of the day, and as we look at the impetuous forward rush of the two friends, their majestic stature and proportions, and the hard and sinewy modelling of their muscles, we can appreciate the extraordinary vigour that already distinguishes Attic sculpture, and that promises wonderful things when a little more beauty and moderation have been added to it.

¹ It is, of course, doubtful whether the statues we now have are derived from the work of Antenor or from that of Critius and Nesiotes, which were set up instead when Xerxes had carried off Antenor's figures; but even if Antenor's were different in style, one may be excused the slight anachronism; a few years later the group by Critius and Nesiotes was in this spot.

If we mount past these statues, toward the entrance of the Acropolis, we can see more of the town on various sides. Here and there are temples, some of them of very early date, some of them showing the more sumptuous work of the Tyrants. But the streets and houses of the town have a very mean aspect, even the houses of such well-known men as Aristides, or Miltiades himself, who is a Tyrant when at home in the Thracian Chersonese, are not to be distinguished by their greater size or magnificence. Most of them are mere hovels of wood and mud or unbaked brick, set perhaps on a stone foundation, and with a flat mud roof; and they are set so close to the narrow streets that it is not safe to open a door from within without first knocking on it to warn passers-by. Reaching the western front of the Acropolis, we see such a quarter just below us, in the hollow between us and the Hill of the Pnyx; though the road that runs through it is a main thoroughfare, it is barely fifteen feet wide—less in places. Here, as usual, the mass of houses is varied by some open spaces. Where the steep path leading straight down in front of us meets the road, there is a great fountain built at the foot of the Pnyx Hill; and from the lions' heads in its face flows the plentiful supply of water which the Tyrant Pisistratus brought in a long tunnel from far up the valley of the Ilissus, just as his friends Theagenes of Megara and Polycrates of Samos made aqueducts for their towns. In front of the fountain is an oblong place; and above this is a precinct dedicated to Amynos, the healing hero,

for the Athenians have not yet introduced the foreign worship of Asclepius to supersede their local cult. A little farther along to the right, just below the Areopagus, is an early triangular precinct, with a temple and an altar, and a wine-press in the corner that marks it as sacred to Dionysus. If we proceed farther to the south, amidst the dismantled terraces of the Pelargicon, now no longer defensible without a wooden barricade, we may see to the south and south-west other early temples. Outside the walls are the huge columns of the Olympieum, and beyond it the suburb of Agræ on the other side of the Ilissus, with the temple of Demeter where the Lesser Mysteries are now established, and recognised as part of the official ceremonies of Eleusis.

Could we return a year or two later, after Xerxes and his devastating host have passed through the country, while the women and children of the Athenians are exiled to Salamis and Ægina and Trœzen, and the men are still awaiting with the rest of the Greek army the crowning victory of Plataea, a very different sight would meet our eyes. The temples are all reduced to charred and blackened ruins, of the town walls but a few short pieces remain, and the houses are all destroyed, except a few in which the leaders of the Persians had established themselves. But the disaster was timely; when the Athenians returned to rebuild and to enlarge their city, they were ready to fill both Acropolis and town with a wealth of architecture, sculpture, and painting that would soon surpass all that the invaders had destroyed.

IV a. On Thucydides, II. 15. 3 and 4

“Before the time of Theseus the city consisted of what is now the Acropolis, and the district outside it to the southward. And a proof of this lies in the fact that the temples of other gods also (as well as Athena) are in the Acropolis, and those without are situated rather toward this part of the city¹—the temple of Olympian Zeus, the Pythium, the temple of Earth, and the temple of Dionysus in the Marshes, in whose honour the older Dionysia are celebrated in the month Anthesterion, according to the custom still observed by the Ionians who came from Athens. And other ancient temples are situated in this region;” and the fountain Callirrhoe or Enneacrunus, being near, is used by the early inhabitants for most important purposes.² “And because of the ancient occupation of this district the Acropolis is still called the City (Polis) by the Athenians.”

In this passage Thucydides makes two distinct statements, and quotes evidence to prove them: (1) that the early city was mainly in the Acropolis; (2) that such portion of it as was outside the Acropolis lay to the south.

The proof of the first statement is simple, and consists of the facts that early shrines existed on the Acropolis,

¹ *I.e.* to the south; it is the interpretation of this clause that is most disputed. See below.

² See Note I a.

and that the Acropolis was still in Thucydides' time called "the city." So far there is no dispute. But the rest of the passage has led to much discussion. The usual interpretation is simple and obvious: it identifies the Olympieum and the Pythium as the well-known temples near the Ilissus, and the Enneacrunus as the spring close to them in the river bed; it places the Dionysium in the Marshes just to the south of the great Theatre, and identifies the shrine of Earth with that mentioned by Pausanias near the Olympieum. All these are to the south or south-east of the Acropolis, and so fit the simplest interpretation of the words of Thucydides. According to this view, the historian, like Curtius and others in modern times, regarded the valley south of the Acropolis as the centre of Athenian civic life in early times. In this he may have been mistaken; he had not the advantage of seeing some of the evidence that has come from recent excavations; but his opinion is clearly expressed and intelligible.

The other theory about the passage, which is advocated by Professor Dörpfeld, regards this interpretation as inconsistent with actual facts, and attempts to reconcile the statements of Thucydides with a different system of Athenian topography. The main objections to the current interpretation are the following:—

(1) The Olympieum and the Pythium beside the Ilissus are too far from the Acropolis to be included within the limits of the primitive city.

(2) The temple of Dionysus in the Marshes was not,

according to Professor Dörpfeld, to the south of the Acropolis near the Theatre, where, indeed, he denies that marshes could ever have existed.

(3) The fountain Callirrhoe in the Ilissus is too far off to be mentioned as near to the primitive city; and moreover, a position of Enneacrunus near the Ilissus cannot be reconciled with the description of Pausanius.

Accordingly Professor Dörpfeld proposes a solution which avoids all these three objections; he says:—

(1) The Olympieum and Pythium mentioned by Thucydides are not those near the Ilissus, but earlier ones, close under the Acropolis; the Pythium he identifies with the cave of Apollo in the north-west face of the Acropolis rock.

(2) The temple of Dionysus in the Marshes is to be identified with an early precinct of Dionysus, containing a wine-press, an altar, and a small temple, which has been found in Professor Dörpfeld's excavations close under the Areopagus.

(3) The fountain Callirrhoe must be identified with one of the springs in the Pnyx Hill facing the Acropolis, and Enneacrunus is the termination of the aqueduct built by Pisistratus to supersede this scanty supply.

Each of these three propositions requires careful consideration; but before investigating them separately and in detail, their general relation to the interpretation of the passage must be understood. It is clear, in the first place, that the position of the temples and the spring, as given by Professor Dörpfeld, does not con-

firm the statement of Thucydides that the early city, so far as it was outside the Acropolis, lay to the south, for they all lie to the west or northwest of the entrance of the Acropolis. This Professor Dörpfeld admits; but he says that the evidence quoted by Thucydides is intended to prove, not that the city outside the Acropolis lay to the south, but that his general statement is correct, as to the early city consisting of the Acropolis and its immediate surroundings. Accordingly Professor Dörpfeld would translate *πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως*, not "in the direction of this side of the city," *i.e.* the south, but "toward this district of the city," *i.e.* the Acropolis and its surroundings. There are two chief objections to this interpretation: the first, that *πρὸς* with the dative would have been far more usual with this meaning; the second, that if such was Thucydides' intention, he need never have mentioned the south at all; it is not required by the context, nor consistent with the evidence he produces. Before Professor Dörpfeld's interpretation is substituted for the more obvious one, it must be shown to be not only admissible, but to be required by the context or the facts of the case; we must then return to the three topographical questions already indicated.

(1) There is no satisfactory evidence for a second Olympieum and Pythium. Strabo, indeed, in mentioning the altar of Zeus Astrapaïos, from which the lightning was observed over Harma before the despatch of the sacred embassy to Delphi, says that it was situated

on the wall between the Pythium and the Olympieum;¹ and the line about these same Pythian lightnings in Euripides' *Ion* certainly associates them with the shrine of Apollo, ὑπὸ Μακρᾶς or ὑπ' Ἀκραις, as it is called in inscriptions of Roman date. If we had no other evidence as to Pythium or Olympieum, we might naturally have inferred that both these temples were situated at this north-west corner of the Acropolis rock, and that the Pythium was identical with the known shrine of Apollo in this place. But it is not disputed that the temples usually known as the Olympieum and the Pythium were situated by the Ilissus; we are therefore forced to accept one of two alternatives: either that Strabo, whose knowledge of Athenian topography is notoriously slight and inaccurate, must have made some mistake, probably in transcribing from another authority, or that there were a second Pythium and Olympieum close under the Acropolis. Professor Dörpfeld, as we have seen, prefers the second alternative; and he would quote in confirmation of it, not only the passage in Thucydides that is now under discussion, but also the statement of Philostratus, in his life of Herodes Atticus, about the Panathenaic ship. After describing this sumptuous structure, which was made to advance over

¹ It is often stated that Harma could not be visible from the region beside the Ilissus, where the well-known Pythium and Olympieum are situated; but this is an exaggeration. The platform of the Olympieum, according to Kaupert's map, is only 1 in 50 below the ridge that intervenes between it and the direction of Harma; so that Harma could be visible from the top of a quite low wall, if no buildings intervened. Still, the place is not a specially convenient one for such observations.

and that the Acropolis was still in Thucydides' time called "the city." So far there is no dispute. But the rest of the passage has led to much discussion. The usual interpretation is simple and obvious: it identifies the Olympieum and the Pythium as the well-known temples near the Ilissus, and the Enneacrunus as the spring close to them in the river bed; it places the Dionysium in the Marshes just to the south of the great Theatre, and identifies the shrine of Earth with that mentioned by Pausanias near the Olympieum. All these are to the south or south-east of the Acropolis, and so fit the simplest interpretation of the words of Thucydides. According to this view, the historian, like Curtius and others in modern times, regarded the valley south of the Acropolis as the centre of Athenian civic life in early times. In this he may have been mistaken; he had not the advantage of seeing some of the evidence that has come from recent excavations; but his opinion is clearly expressed and intelligible.

The other theory about the passage, which is advocated by Professor Dörpfeld, regards this interpretation as inconsistent with actual facts, and attempts to reconcile the statements of Thucydides with a different system of Athenian topography. The main objections to the current interpretation are the following:—

(1) The Olympieum and the Pythium beside the Ilissus are too far from the Acropolis to be included within the limits of the primitive city.

(2) The temple of Dionysus in the Marshes was not,

according to Professor Dörpfeld, to the south of the Acropolis near the Theatre, where, indeed, he denies that marshes could ever have existed.

(3) The fountain Callirrhoe in the Ilissus is too far off to be mentioned as near to the primitive city; and moreover, a position of Enneacrunus near the Ilissus cannot be reconciled with the description of Pausanius.

Accordingly Professor Dörpfeld proposes a solution which avoids all these three objections; he says:—

(1) The Olympieum and Pythium mentioned by Thucydides are not those near the Ilissus, but earlier ones, close under the Acropolis; the Pythium he identifies with the cave of Apollo in the north-west face of the Acropolis rock.

(2) The temple of Dionysus in the Marshes is to be identified with an early precinct of Dionysus, containing a wine-press, an altar, and a small temple, which has been found in Professor Dörpfeld's excavations close under the Areopagus.

(3) The fountain Callirrhoe must be identified with one of the springs in the Pnyx Hill facing the Acropolis, and Enneacrunus is the termination of the aqueduct built by Pisistratus to supersede this scanty supply.

Each of these three propositions requires careful consideration; but before investigating them separately and in detail, their general relation to the interpretation of the passage must be understood. It is clear, in the first place, that the position of the temples and the spring, as given by Professor Dörpfeld, does not con-

Pythium mentioned by Thucydides must here, as elsewhere, be the well-known temples near the Ilissus.

(2) The temple of Dionysus in the Marshes offers a problem more difficult to decide. The quarter of Limnæ or the Marshes is generally placed by topographers south of the theatre, but there is little evidence, apart from this passage, to confirm the theory. On the other hand, I think Professor Dörpfeld goes too far in denying that this region can ever have been marshy; the Codrus inscription proves that it was intersected by a great ditch, of which the mud was valuable for putting on land. It is, however, to be observed that Thucydides expressly distinguishes this temple as associated with the older Dionysia; and his object in doing this is evidently to avoid confusion with the better-known precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus, which adjoined the theatre.

The early precinct of Dionysus found by Professor Dörpfeld below the Areopagus was forgotten and built over in Roman times, though some survival of its cultus may have been kept up by the Iobacchi, whose hall was built above part of the site. It is hardly credible that this fate could have overtaken a shrine so important in state religion as the Lenæum with its annual festival; and the whole precinct is extremely small for celebrating, in the flourishing days of Athens, such a popular festival as the Lenæa or the older Dionysia in the month Anthesterion. It is to be observed, of course, that the identity of the Lenæum

and the Dionysium in the Marshes, though often assumed, has never been proved; and so it cannot be used as an argument on either side. The words of Thucydides, however, show plainly that the Dionysium in the Marshes was not identical with the precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus by the theatre; nor is there any very clear evidence to show where it was.

(3) The evidence for the position of Enneacrunus has been discussed elsewhere; and we have seen that there is a strong consensus of authority in favour of its being in the Ilissus — a consensus strong enough to outweigh the contrary evidence of Pausanias. Thucydides' words in this passage would not be difficult to reconcile with either view. The spring in the Ilissus is close to the Olympieum and Pythium; but, on the other hand, a spring in the face of the Pnyx Hill would be near, even if the town outside the Acropolis were mostly situated to the south. It is not necessary, though it is natural, to regard Thucydides' quotation of Enneacrunus as part of the evidence he gives for the city lying south; it might well enough be in confirmation of his general statements about the early city.

It will be seen, from this examination of the disputable points in detail, that while the evidence as to the Dionysium in the Marshes is indecisive, the Olympieum and the Pythium must be the temples near the Ilissus, to the south-east of the Acropolis, and Callirrhoe in this case is to be identified with the spring near these temples. In this way the whole passage means what

it appears to mean at first sight; while, even if it be possible to extract from the Greek a meaning consistent with Professor Dörpfeld's theories as to Athenian topography, such an interpretation would never occur to a scholar unacquainted with the facts.¹ It is not relevant to quote Thucydides' notorious obscurity; he is never intentionally or unintentionally misleading, and in this passage he is evidently trying to make his meaning as clear as possible by appealing to facts known to his readers; and it is incredible that under these circumstances he should express himself in a way that was sure to be misunderstood. Put in its simplest form, his statement amounts to this, "The early city consisted of the Acropolis and the region to the south of it; in proof of this may be quoted the position of certain early temples inside and outside the Acropolis." Those who hold with Professor Dörpfeld that all the temples here quoted as lying outside the Acropolis lay to the west and north-west of it, practically attribute to Thucydides an extraordinary lack of logical clearness and appreciation of the value of evidence—the very qualities for which the historian is usually celebrated. And this is quite apart from the grammatical possibility of justifying Professor Dörpfeld's interpretation of the words in detail. These considerations compel us to hold to the usual interpretation; the only topographical inference from it, beyond what can be ascertained inde-

¹ *Pace* Dr. Verrall, who says it would have occurred to him. But Thucydides could not expect such ingenuity in all his readers.

pendently from other sources, is that the Dionysium in the Marshes was to the south of the Acropolis, — where, exactly, we cannot say.

Finally, if we accept the traditional interpretation, we must see how the objections raised against it by Professor Dörpfeld can be met.

(1) The position of the Olympieum and Pythium is not, indeed, near enough to the Acropolis for them to have been included within the small primitive city. But Thucydides does not say they were; and it is a very common thing for such shrines to lie outside city walls. All Thucydides says is that their position relative to the primitive city is such as to show that it lay to the south of the Acropolis; and this is true.

(2) The position of the Marshes, and of the temple of Dionysus in them, is too problematic to prove or disprove any theory.

(3) The fountain of Callirrhoe in the Ilissus is indeed far off, and so this objection carries some weight; but the fact of its use by the inhabitants of the primitive city is strikingly confirmed by the statement of Herodotus. After all it is only about 650 yards from the nearest point of the Acropolis, and less still from the region south of the Acropolis which would be included in the primitive city, — no very great distance to go for good spring water in Greece, — and the Olympieum would give shelter and protection on the way.

CHAPTER V

EARLY ATTIC ART

THE sack of the Athenian Acropolis by the Persians marks an epoch in the architectural history of the city. It also marks an epoch in the history of Attic art, as known to us at the present day; for the fragments buried after the return of the Athenians, which now, after their recovery, are arranged in the museums of modern Athens, give us a representative series of pottery, of bronzes, of architecture, and of sculpture. This series can be dated with certainty at its lower limit; and, from its completeness and the uniformity of character which distinguishes it, in spite of minor differences, it can give us a good general notion of the artistic achievements of a Greek city before the Persian Wars — of a city which, though at this period but one of many rivals, was during the succeeding century to attain, in art as well as in literature, an acknowledged preëminence.


The only other sites that can be compared with the Athenian Acropolis in the number and variety of the monuments of early Greek art that their excavation has yielded are Olympia and Delphi; but these were

both of them common centres of Hellenic life, where the various Greek states emulated one another in the richness of the buildings and the offerings that they dedicated. At Athens, on the other hand, although of course foreign offerings are by no means excluded, the great majority of the buildings and dedications represent the products of local art and industry. It is probable that, if accident had preserved for us with equal completeness the early artistic records of many other Greek cities, of Sparta or Argos or Sicyon, for example, of Thebes or Chalcis, of Miletus or of Syracuse, we should find in them almost, if not quite, as interesting a series. But it is peculiarly fortunate for us that, if only one city was to yield us so full a record of its early art, that city should be Athens; for we can thus follow the continuity of its development from the earliest to the latest times, and can see the same national characteristics again and again asserting themselves under changing conditions at home and under varying influences from abroad. It is not only the excavations of the Acropolis that have contributed to our knowledge of early Attic art; the early cemeteries of Athens and Attica have also yielded a great number of antiquities, especially pottery. The great cemetery of the Ceramicus, just outside the Dipylon Gate, in particular, contained an immense number of vases of all periods, not only placed within the graves, but also set up as monuments above them, just as the same cemetery has, for later times, given us the

unrivalled series of the Athenian sculptured tombstones.

From about the eighth to the fifth century B.C., it is the pottery which is, in some ways, the most characteristic product of Attic art and handicraft, and that offers us the most continuous record of development. We have, indeed, records of a much earlier time, in the vases and fragments of Mycenæan type that have been found among the remains of the same period on the Acropolis, and in tombs like those of Spata, of Menidi, and of Thoricus. But these do not, so far as we can judge at present, show any peculiar local characteristics, other than those that belong to the whole class of "Mycenæan" antiquities in Greece; much of them may be of foreign importation. Still less are the yet earlier prehistoric fragments of pottery that have been found in Athens to be regarded as specifically Attic; rather, they belong to a common stock which extends all round the Mediterranean Sea. It is when we come to the geometrical period that the potters of the Ceramicus, the Athenian "Potters' Field," first vindicate for Athens the position which it always afterwards retained in the history of Greek ceramic art. The "Dipylon" vases, as they are generally called from the fact that the majority of them have been found in the cemetery outside the Dipylon Gate, are not, indeed, in their simpler examples, essentially different from geometrical vases found elsewhere on the Greek mainland and the Ægean Islands. They show the

same rigid patterns such as might be drawn, the straight lines with a ruler, the curved with a compass; the same predilection for varieties of the "key pattern," from a simple zigzag up to an elaborate meander, and for concentric circles, or circles joined by sloping tangents, in contrast to the free and flowing lines of Mycenæan decoration. Even the friezes of aquatic birds and of gazelle-like animals, perhaps ibexes, are to be found outside Athens; and so is the rigid division of the whole field of ornamentation into a series of zones, the broader ones divided up into panels like the metopes and triglyphs of a Doric temple. The most characteristic features of the Attic or Dipylon variety of geometrical vases are the following: their form is usually either narrow and very high, especially in the neck, or else of a squat cylindrical shape, usually with a flat lid and handles modelled in the form of horses; they are frequently of enormous size, especially those intended to be set up as monuments over tombs. These large vases usually have very high conical bases, and their handles are usually placed in horizontally set pairs on each side; the projection between each pair is sometimes shaped and painted to represent the head of an ibex, to which the handles serve as horns. It is, however, the subjects represented on the Dipylon vases that give them their chief interest. Men and horses are frequently figured, both in a conventional geometrical style of drawing that unduly elongates the limbs and makes the waist unnaturally slim;



the upper part of the human body is usually a mere triangle, except when it is covered by a Bœotian shield; the head is almost birdlike in form. The scenes are for the most part appropriate to the destination of the



DIPYLON VASE, WITH FUNERAL.

vases; funeral processions are a favourite subject, and are worked out with an amount of detail which seems almost inconsistent with the primitive nature of the drawing. We sometimes see the corpse resting on a hearse which is mounted on wheels, and overshadowed by a gorgeous canopy. Around and beneath it are mourners men and women, with

their hands to their heads in the conventional attitude of grief. The cortège is accompanied by numerous chariots, and another frieze often contains a band of chariots only, which may be an allusion to the chariot races which usually formed a part of funeral games. Another favourite subject on Dipylon vases is the ship with its banks of rowers, sometimes on a very elaborate and extensive scale,¹ and even scenes of naval combat. These vases, in spite of the crudeness and convention

¹ As in the case published by Mr. Murray in *J.H.S.* XIX. PL. VIII.

ality of their drawing, show us some of the most extensive representations of scenes from actual life that are known to us in Greek art; mythological scenes are unusual upon Dipylon vases.¹ Thus, so far as the choice of subject is concerned, the Dipylon vase is in the same stage of artistic development that we see in the Homeric description of the shield of Achilles, though the technique implied by that description finds closer analogies elsewhere.

The period to which the Dipylon vases must be assigned can be ascertained with some degree of exactness, especially as to its lower limit. Certain tombs excavated near the Dipylon in 1891 contained not only vases of characteristic Dipylon ware, but also some foreign importations, including two small porcelain lions of Egyptian manufacture. These lions can be dated from their fabric, and from the hieroglyphics with which they are inscribed, to the age of the Saitic Dynasty,—that is to say, to the seventh century B.C.² It follows that the tombs in question cannot belong to an earlier date than this; they cannot be later, because we have, from the sixth century onward, a continuous succession of the Attic fabrics that follow the disappearance of the Dipylon ware. The earlier limit of the Dipylon period is not so easy to fix. Fragments of geometrical vases, indistinguishable from the Dipylon

¹ Perhaps the only example is the vase mentioned in the last note.

² This date is confirmed by both Professor Petrie (see *J.H.S.* XII. p. 338, note) and by M. Naville (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1893, p. 189).

type, have been found on various sites in Greece together with late examples of Mycenæan pottery; but even this fact does not give us a clear criterion, for, although we know the flourishing age of the Mycenæan civilisation in Greece to have been about 1400–1200 B.C., it is by no means certain how long the later stages of Mycenæan art lasted on before its final extinction.

The origin of the Dipylon fabric and the history of its naturalisation in Athens are among the most puzzling of artistic problems; and recent excavation has not contributed much to their solution. For we cannot as yet trace the stages by which it was evolved, whether by growth from some single and original type of ornamentation, or by a gradual transformation of some other decorative system. In either case we find the Dipylon style already developed into a complete system when it first occurs in Attica, in succession to Mycenæan pottery. The usual explanation of such a phenomenon is the intrusion of foreign imports or foreign influence, if not an alien immigration or conquest. The known history of the Athenians, who prided themselves on their continuous autochthony, precludes the latter possibility. And if foreign import or influence be assumed, we have still to find the source of that influence, for, although geometrical pottery of a similar nature is found elsewhere, it has nowhere as yet been found in sufficient quantity or in a primitive enough form for us to be able to trace its origin. It is possible that future excavations may throw more light on this ques-

tion; for the present we must be content with the fact that the Dipylon style became and remained for some time characteristic of the Attic potters, and that they treated it with a vigour and originality that entitled them to claim it as their own, from whatever source it was ultimately derived. Toward the end of its Attic development it became merged in a new style which is commonly known as Phaleric, because the best-known examples of it have been found at Phalerum. This ware is, for the most part, of a smaller and more delicate type, though a few larger vases exist. It is distinguished from the Dipylon pottery mainly by the fact that it introduces motives, both animal and decorative, which are of Oriental origin. It thus corresponds more or less in period to the so-called Oriental style of pottery which we find elsewhere—particularly at Corinth and at Rhodes, and on the coast of Asia Minor. The ornamentation of this latter pottery is probably derived from an imitation of Oriental woven fabrics; it borrows from the same source the rosette, the band of lotus, the palmette, and other similar devices imitative of flowers or plants; and it mingles with them the fantastic winged creations that are familiar in Oriental art,—gryphons and sphinxes, and human-headed birds (sirens), as well as lions, stags, boars, dogs, and other animals. The "Oriental" type of Greek pottery also has a way of filling the field around the figures with various ornaments, doubtless in imitation of the woven fabrics in which the threads of warp and woof had to be crossed

as often as possible, and so any expanse of a simple plain colour had to be avoided. This "Oriental" style never became indigenous in Athens, as it did in many other Greek cities at this time. But it exercised a



AMPHORA FROM HYMETTUS.

From *Jahrbuch des deutschen Instituts*.

strong influence on the Phaleric ware, which, while retaining the technique and often the shape of the Dipylon vases, substituted motives derived from an Oriental source, either wholly or in part, for the traditional ornaments and subjects of Dipylon ware. The Phaleric pottery, however, still retained some of the most characteristic subjects of the Dipylon ware, — men on foot and in chariots, armed warriors, sometimes in combat, and men and women in the choric dances. The human figures are drawn with more

freedom, though still in a conventional manner; but the predilection for scenes from daily life continues to be characteristic of the Attic potter. The period to which the Phaleric pottery belongs can be fairly accurately defined. It succeeds the Dipylon style, which was, as

we have seen, still in full activity in the seventh century B.C. Yet it has no painted inscriptions, and only one incised inscription is known at present as occurring upon it — and that an inscription which shows us the Attic alphabet in a more primitive form than is otherwise recorded. It seems to disappear before the fabrics which are characteristic of the beginning of the sixth century. From these facts it seems clear that the Phaleric ware must be assigned to the closing years of the seventh century B.C.; there is no need to give it any great extension in time. It would thus coincide with the age of the rise of tyrants in Greece generally, and with the time of Cylon's attempt at tyranny in Athens and Draco's legislation. The modification, in fact, that came over the Dipylon style at this time is a part of the general awakening to new ideas and new impulses, and is contemporary with the rise of free sculpture in Greece, as contrasted with purely decorative art. At first we find the new influences merely modifying the Dipylon ware into the Phaleric, but very soon we notice an essential change, which led to the supremacy of the Attic potters. This change consists partly in the use of superior clay and improved pigments, partly in the adoption of a freer and more vigorous style of drawing. It is now that the beautiful red clay of the Athenian Ceramicus first gains its true value, being used, not only for the general substance of the vases, but also for the more finely ground slip that forms their visible surface, and that has ever since been regarded as the ideal

"terra-cotta" colour. A fine contrast to this red colour is offered by the black varnish paint, with its even, glossy surface; the two in various combinations produce the black-figured and red-figured vases. Neither of these two classes is, of course, peculiar to Athens, nor was the black-figured technique probably invented there;¹ but the quality both of clay and of pigment soon brought Athens to the front, and created a demand for her vases throughout the civilised world. Sometimes the red colour of the earth forms the ground over the whole vase, and the figures and ornamentation are merely drawn upon it in black silhouette; sometimes the greater part of the surface of the vase is covered over with lustrous black varnish, panels only of red being left for the insertion of the black figures. Some of the earlier examples of these Attic black-figured vases have merely zones of animals, one below another, such as we may see on Corinthian, Rhodian, and other fabrics; but the Attic predilection for scenes with human figures soon asserted itself in this technique also. One of the finest early examples is the enormous vase, found in the Ceramicus,

¹ The older view — still held by some — is that in this matter Athens was indebted to Corinth; some even go so far as to call the early Attic vases Corintho-Attic. But the influence of Corinth on Athens, and the counter-influence of Athens on Corinth, are matters on which much difference of opinion may and does exist. There is no reason why the same tendency should not have been operating simultaneously, owing to the constant interchange of exported wares, not only in Corinth and Athens, but in many other cities which possess characteristic fabrics of early black-figured pottery. And, moreover, many early black-figured vases have been found on the eastern side of Attica, and at Eretria, which show no Corinthian affinities, and may well have influenced the potters of Athens.

and having, as its principal subject, the Gorgons pursuing Perseus—who, curiously enough, is not represented—and their decapitated sister sinking in death; on its neck is a group of Heracles and the Centaur, Nessus (Νέσος). It is to be noted that in both these cases the subject chosen is only a part of a well-known tale, and that the rest is not even implied by the presence of Perseus in the one case or of Deianira in the other. The decapitation of Medusa by Perseus, which preceded his flight, and the violence of the Centaur to Deianira, which brought on him his punishment, are both familiar subjects in early art; if they had been present on the same vase, we might have understood the absence of one of the principal characters in each of the scenes artistically depicted. As it is, one is forced to the conclusion that the vase painter has chosen for the decoration of his vase two scenes which, in themselves, are incomplete and only partially intelligible, and which must have belonged to a series of well-known subjects that completed and illustrated one another. The existence of such a repertoire, at such a time, might seem strange if we considered only these Attic vases; but, as we shall see, there were already other branches of decorative art that had a whole stock of such subjects available.

The most complete contrast to this vase, with its two scenes executed on a large scale, is offered by the famous François vase in Florence, which alone supplies us with a whole gallery of mythological pictures. It is signed

by Clitias as potter and Ergotimus as painter; and their names, as well as the inscriptions attached to all the figures, which are in Attic characters, show that the vase was made in Athens, though it was found in Italy. These two large vases may be taken as representative of two main types of early Attic black-figured ware. The majority of the vases of this ware found both in Athens and outside it are smaller and less elaborate; they tend to conform to a limited number of well-known shapes, among which the hydria and the amphora are the commonest for the large classes, the jug or œnochoë, the cylix, and the lecythus for the smaller. It is impossible here to give even a sketch of the development of black-figured vase-painting in Athens. It was customary in this and the succeeding period for the chief potters to sign their work, and any study of vases must begin with a careful and detailed observation of the style and idiosyncrasies of the various artists; such a study is only possible with the help of numerous accurate illustrations, or, better still, of an extensive collection of the vases themselves. Around the signed vases the rest will group themselves into classes of which the date and character can be readily distinguished. All that is possible here is to note the general tendencies of the Attic potters, and the periods of their work.

The black silhouette in which the figures were first drawn was made by the finer potters of this period little more than a ground to carry elaborate designs in incised lines, and also in purple and white pigment. The par-

allel wavy lines that indicate the hair of men or beasts, and the rich diaper pattern of drapery, are rendered with a delicacy more appropriate to fine metal work than to pottery; indeed, the technique used is rather that of the bronze worker or goldsmith. We shall see later that this extreme love of elaboration and delicacy, often to the detriment of strength and vigour, is characteristic of other branches of art also during this period at Athens. It was, however, also an age of experiments; and many different methods for adding details to the untractable black silhouette were tried. One method was to cover the red clay with a white pigment, against which the black figures stood out still more clearly; this, in foreign examples, had already been associated with the practice of leaving part of the figures — especially the faces — in outline; the effect was not unlike that produced on the Attic vases themselves by the addition of white pigment over the black on the faces and other parts of female figures. Within the outlines it was then possible to add details by lines drawn in black or colour, and not incised. From this system was evolved the technique of painting in outline on a white ground, which is among the most beautiful and characteristic of those used by Attic potters about the beginning of the fifth century. The black silhouette figures on a white ground, which are commonest on lecythi, probably continued to be made even in the fifth century, and are often of very careless work; the evolution of the polychrome lecythus belongs to the period after the Persian Wars. Another experiment, which,

however, did not lead to any very great results, was the painting of figures in opaque white pigment over the black varnish of the ground; the interest of this experiment lies chiefly in the fact that it at least inverts the apparent values, and shows us light figures against a dark ground.

The great change from black-figured to red-figured pottery produces the same result in a simpler and more satisfactory manner. Here, instead of drawing the figures in black silhouette, the artist merely draws the outline of the figures, and then fills in the whole of the background with black varnish-paint, so that the figures stand out in the beautiful red colour of the Attic clay. On this red surface it is then possible to add all details with a brush or pen dipped in the same varnish, or in a diluted mixture of it for the lighter lines. This is the technique in which the majority of the finest examples of Greek ceramic art was executed. It used to be generally supposed that these examples must be about contemporary with the masterpieces of Greek sculpture of the middle of the fifth century; and such a statement will actually be found in some of the older handbooks. When, however, one looks at the style of the vases themselves, their rich Ionic draperies, their elaboration of detail, it is easy to realise that the earlier red-figured vases are contemporary with the pre-Persian sculpture which we can see in the Acropolis Museum; and, as a matter of fact, there have been found, in the Acropolis excavations, among the rubbish

buried after the Persian sack of Athens, not only fragments of the earliest red-figured vases, but also portions of painted vases with the names of the great masters of vase-painting, Euphronios, Duris, Brygos, and Hieron. As most of these fragments must be earlier than 480 B.C., it follows that these masters were already working in the earlier decades of the fifth century, and that we must assign the earlier examples of red-figured vase-painting to the closing years of the sixth century B.C. The chronology of vase-painting, as thus established upon clear external evidence, shows that the development of the art, from early black-figured ware down to the first red-figured, occupied a much shorter period than has sometimes been thought probable; but this rapid advance is by no means incredible, when we consider the extraordinarily quick development in politics and literature, no less than in art, that marks the century preceding the Persian Wars.

If we found it impossible to follow in any detail the development of vase-painting in black-figured, still more is this the case with red-figured vases, since the potters, as their art improves, advance in individuality and freedom. Those who wish to study the subject must be referred to the numerous special treatises that have been devoted to it.¹ In the earlier examples we see little more than an inversion of the black-figured tech-

¹ For a bibliography of them see Huddilston, *Lessons from Greek Pottery*. The most important are Klein's *Vasen mit Meistersignaturen* and *Euphronios*, and Hartwig's *Meisterschalen*.

nique, with the same love of elaborate detail; the same conventions or errors of drawing persist; for example, the eye is always drawn as if full-face when the face is in profile; and the eyes of men are rounded, with circular pupil and iris drawn, while those of women are mere narrow slits; here again we shall find an analogy in sculpture. Just at the beginning of the fifth century we find a stronger and more dignified style coming into vogue, as it does in sculpture also. The simpler Doric drapery replaces the rich folds of the Ionic chiton and peplos, and the drawing too becomes more vigorous and bolder, both in what it attempts and in what it performs. The close resemblance that has been marked between the drawing on the finest of the vases of Euphronios and the profile of the Delphi charioteer, which can be dated to 482-472 B.C., confirms the chronology of vase-painting as established by the Acropolis excavations; and the metopes of the Athenian treasury at Delphi, which was dedicated from the spoils of Marathon, also show the strongest affinity of style to the severer red-figured vases. Thus vase-painting, instead of having a separate development of its own, fits in exactly with what we know of contemporary work in bronze and marble.

The vases that have been found in Athens come mainly, as we have seen, from two places, the Acropolis and the cemetery of the Ceramicus. That is to say, they were either dedicated to the gods or buried with the dead, if not set up as monuments over them. The same

two causes, dedication and burial, are responsible for the great majority of the vases found outside Attica also; but the tombs have yielded by far the richest harvest, and, naturally, have more frequently preserved complete examples. The museums of Europe are full of black-figured and red-figured vases found in the cemeteries of Etruria; and the finest of these are nearly all of Attic workmanship. They thus testify to a very extensive export trade in pottery from Athens to Italy. The vases found in Athens itself cannot compare with those found in Italy, either for quantity or completeness of preservation; but some of the fragments found on the Acropolis are unsurpassed by any in beauty of fabric and delicacy of drawing. No distinction can be drawn between the pottery found on the Acropolis and the similar vases found in Etruria; and from this fact several inferences may be drawn. It is clear, in the first place, that the vases in question were exported from Athens; and although this was generally admitted in the case of the finest examples, it was disputed by high authorities,¹ especially in the case of some of those that showed more careless drawing, and were supposed to be later, possibly local, imitations. Specimens of this more careless work, as well as of the finer, have been found in the Acropolis excavations, and so have decided this question.² In the second place, it is evident that the vases found in

¹ Especially by Brunn, in his *Probleme in der Geschichte der Vasenmalerei*, and elsewhere.

² Of course there exist local Italian fabrics in imitation of Attic pottery; but these are different, and can be readily distinguished in most cases.

Italy do not represent a special ware prepared only for the foreign market, but that they were intended for use at home also—in fact, that they represent the ordinary output of the Attic potteries. The purposes for which the vases were made is a question not so easy to answer; but we learn, again from the discoveries on the Acropolis, that they were not, as has sometimes been supposed, made expressly for burying in tombs with the dead. The funeral lecythi were made for this purpose; but ordinary vases must have been placed in the tombs as ordinary articles of household furniture, else they could not have been fitting offerings to dedicate to the gods on the Acropolis. The same inference may be drawn from the fact that there not infrequently appear upon vase-paintings vases resembling the one on which the scene is painted, in actual domestic use. Amphoræ, hydriæ, and cylices were doubtless used to hold wine or water or to drink from; and although vessels of metal or of plain pottery were perhaps commoner, the former among the richer classes, the other among the poorer, there is no reason to suppose that the painted vases were intended only for ornament or for ceremonial use.

Certain classes of vases, however, had special purposes. The best-known of these are the Panathenaic prize amphoræ; although most of the examples of these that survive belong to a later age, they certainly existed in the early days of black-figured painting. They were made, as Pindar tells us, to contain the oil from the sacred olive trees of Athens:—

γαίᾳ δὲ κανθείσῃ πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαίας,
 . . . ἐν ἀγγέων
 ἔρκεσιν παμποικίλοις.

This sacred oil was given as a prize to the victors in the Panathenaic games, in varying quantities, from 140 amphoræ to 1. The Panathenaic amphoræ always have a figure of Athena on one side, and a representation of the event for which they were given as prize on the other. It is hardly probable that the victor in the chariot race, for example, received 140 of these vases. Originally, perhaps, the figure of Athena may have been an official guarantee of the genuineness of the oil; but, after the first, it seems more likely that the oil, which was of real commercial value, was stored in more suitable vessels, and that one painted vase, perhaps, was presented to each victor as a symbol of his prize. Such Panathenaic vases might appropriately enough be dedicated to a divinity, especially to the goddess in whose honour the contest took place; it might also be set up in the victor's home, and be buried with him in his tomb.

Almost any kind of vase might be so dedicated or buried; the dedication would probably mean either that the vase itself or some other, which it symbolised, had been used in some sacrifice or religious ceremony; the burial vase in its original intention was probably for the use of the deceased, though this notion was probably merged, in historical times, in a more abstract idea of doing him honour. Certain classes of vases were, how-

ever, peculiarly devoted to funeral use. The reference of Aristophanes to the painter,—

ὅς τοις νέκροισι ζωγραφεῖ τὰς ληκύθους,

must refer to a custom older than his own time. The lecythus, though used in life also, was peculiarly the vase of the dead, probably because it held the unguents used for a temporary embalming before the funeral. The ala-



EARLY PROTHESIS VASE, WITH TOMB.
From *Monumenti dell' Istituto*, VIII. 4, 5.

bastron, a kindred form of vase, served the same purpose, as we may remember from a familiar passage in the New Testament.¹ The lecythus was not only placed in the tomb, but small lecythi were set upon it outside, and sometimes a large one was

erected over it as a monument. Imitations of these were later made in marble, and formed, as we shall see,² a not uncommon kind of tombstone.

We have noticed how the Dipylon vases, with representations of funerals, were used in early times as monuments over tombs. In continuation of this tradition we find a whole set of interesting vases, called *prothesis* vases from the subject upon them, which is usually the

¹ Mark xiv. 3, where it is wrongly translated "alabaster box" in the A.V.

² See Chapter XI., "The Ceramicus."

"laying out" of the corpse surrounded by mourners. That these vases were used as monuments is proved by the most satisfactory evidence: on one of them the mound of a tomb is depicted, with a vase of identical shape set up on the top of it. The shape of the vases varies slightly, but most of them have a high neck and two long handles; and certain traditional ornaments, such as a snake around the top, are usually preserved. They usually have no bottom, and so libations poured into them would sink into the tomb over which they were placed. We see on them various stages of vase-painting, from black-figured up to advanced red-figured style. Another series of vases, identical in shape with these, has a different set of subjects; they represent marriage ceremonies, especially the bridal procession and the toilet of the bride. And on one of these vases we see in the procession a maiden carrying a vase identical in shape with the one on which it is painted.¹ This can be no other than the *λουτροφόρος*, the vessel in which the water for the bridal bath was brought from Callirrhoe. Its resemblance to the prothesis vases and its erection over the tomb might well puzzle us but for the clue given by Demosthenes,² who quotes a *λουτροφόρος* set up over a tomb as conclusive evidence that the deceased was unmarried. It is a fair inference that all the vases of this shape were set up over the tombs of those who died unmarried. The symbolism is not hard to understand for those who remember the

¹ *Mon. Inst.* X. 34.

² *Περὶ Λεωχ.* 18. See Wolters, *Mitth. Ath.* XVI. p. 371.

familiar Greek metaphor that those who died unmarried had Hades for their bridegroom: —

οὐ γάμον ἀλλ' Ἀΐδαν ἐπινυμφίδιον.

These high two-handled vases were, as well as the lecythi, later imitated in marble;¹ and there is little doubt that the marble λουτροφόρος also continued the same symbolism.

The history of decorative work in metal shows many analogies to that of vase-painting, and has to follow the same stages of development. Here we are concerned mainly with bronzes, which are associated with bone and ivory carvings of a similar character; and these bronzes have, for the most part, been found in the Acropolis excavations.² They were not, indeed, so numerous as the bronzes found at Olympia.³ But the Olympia bronzes serve to fill up the gaps in the Athenian series, and to explain many things that would otherwise have been isolated and inexplicable fragments. But the finer work found in Athens has a quality of its own beyond anything of the same class at Olympia, and serves as an epitome of the Attic style of the period.

But little has been found in Attica of metal work⁴ preceding the geometrical period, though ornaments in porcelain and other materials have been found in Attica at Spata and Menidi, for example, which show no essen-

¹ See Chapter XI. below.

² Bather, *J.H.S.* XIII. 232-271; De Ridder, *Catalogue des bronzes trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes*.

³ See Olympia IV., die Bronzen (Furtwängler).

⁴ The most important is a set of Mycenaean bronzes found in the Acropolis; cf. De Ridder, *op. cit.* I. p. iv.

tial difference from other objects of the same period found at Mycenæ and elsewhere. Thus they confirm the testimony of the vases that Athens, while sharing the prevalent "Mycenæan" civilisation and art, did not strike out any characteristic line of its own. In the geometrical period we might expect to find a development in decorative metal work corresponding to the Dipylon pottery; and the Acropolis excavations have supplied us with some evidence to justify this expectation. There were found, in the first place, a great number of portions of tripods and other decorative pieces of bronze, with characteristic geometrical designs resembling those on the Dipylon pottery. The designs on these are all incised, not raised in relief; indeed, the bronze of which they are made, being very hard and brittle in texture, could hardly be treated in any other way. On some of the more elaborate, and presumably later, of these geometrical bronzes, we find both Oriental types of ornaments, such as rosettes and palmettes, and beasts, leopards and boars for example, such as one sees on vases of the "Oriental" style, and through the same influence, on Phaleric ware. It is hardly a rash inference that these geometric transitional bronzes are probably contemporary, or at least at the same stage of artistic development, as the Phaleric vases.

Later, just as we find the influence of various foreign styles of pottery, "Oriental" and others, affecting the early Attic black-figured vases that succeed the geometrical style, so too we find foreign bronze style and

technique influencing the Attic bronze-worker. Some of those foreign models have actually been found on the Acropolis, including, on the one hand, a Phœnician or Cypriote bowl with a *repoussé* decoration of winged sphinxes and other Oriental forms, and, on the other hand, specimens of the very fine and decorative reliefs generally recognised as Argive or Argeo-Corinthian. The bronze of this class of reliefs is of a much finer quality, very ductile and flexible, and so adapted to fine *repoussé* work. We find on the Acropolis a large class of bronze reliefs which combine the characteristics of both the geometrical and the Oriental styles, combining the use of incised lines with a slight relief. On this class we find many scenes represented not unlike those on early vases; and they may very probably represent the Attic bronze work of the sixth century.

So far we have been concerned mainly with decorative reliefs. To these must be added a great number of ornaments, handles of bowls, etc., some of which are very fine specimens of delicacy in workmanship. The finest of them, which take the form of figures in the round, or have such figures attached to them, are not to be distinguished artistically from the statuettes; and these, as well as fragments of larger figures in bronze, belong rather to the general development of sculpture. This slight sketch of decorative bronze work in Athens must suffice to show that it takes its place beside vase-painting as a part of the general development of Attic art before the Persian Wars.

The Attic architecture of the same period is known to us mainly from the remains of early buildings which were either used as substructures or foundations of later buildings, or as rubble to fill up the terracing of the Acropolis. So far as the buildings to which these earlier fragments of architecture belong can be identified, they have already been described in Chapter III. But many drums and capitals of columns and portions of entablature or moulding have been found which cannot be assigned with certainty to any known temple or shrine; and the same may be said of a good deal of the architectural sculpture that has been recovered. There were, doubtless, many small temples on the Acropolis or in its neighbourhood of which we know nothing, and of which we cannot even trace the foundations. The architectural members of some of them have been pieced together, and one or two of them have been partially reconstructed in the smaller Museum on the Acropolis. By their help we can realise that Doric architecture—for all these early shrines appear to have been of the Doric order—went through the same stages at Athens as elsewhere. The capitals in the earlier buildings are low and bulging, and gradually approach the apparently flat but really subtly curved shape which we see in the Parthenon. A good intermediate example is offered by the capitals of the colonnade added by Pisistratus to the Early Temple of Athena, which are distinctly curved in outline, but far removed from the

rounded, bowl-like shape of their predecessors. The entablature, too, has various experimental features which show the Doric order not yet stereotyped as it was in later times, the number of the guttæ, for example, and other details of finish and proportion, still varying considerably.

There is no certain example in early Athens of a complete building of the Ionic order, although Mr. Penrose would restore as such the peristyle of the Old Temple of Athena. There are no remains of any Ionic entablature, and the numerous Ionic capitals of early form that have been found on the Acropolis are, for the most part, ornamental pedestals for statues. The large Ionic capital attributed by Mr. Penrose to the early temple must probably be explained in this way also, for it has no fellow. This set of Ionic capitals is, however, of great interest for the light they throw on the development of their architectural form, and because they show us the stages by which the torus and the volute were harmonised into a perfect composition. It is hardly, however, to be supposed that this development took place in mere isolated capitals and pedestals rather than in complete Ionic buildings; and so the Athenian examples are of value rather as reflecting the progress made elsewhere, than as showing us the Ionic order actually in its growth. It is a curious fact that, while there are numerous signs of Ionic influence in Athens,—among which these capitals must be reckoned,—no

Ionic column earlier than those of the Propylæa, and no complete Ionic building earlier than the Nike temple, have been found;¹ for in the great Ionic cities, such as Miletus, Ephesus, Samos, and Naucratis, the Ionic order was generally used for temples from the earliest times. It seems a fair inference that, in architecture at least, the artistic affinities of the Athenians were with the mainland of Greece rather than with their kinsfolk, the Ionians, on the east of the Ægean.

Most of the small Ionic capitals found are carved in Parian or Naxian marble, and there are also some cornices and other pieces of entablature in marble with the remains of painted patterns on them; other cornices and mouldings are in painted terra-cotta. But the bulk of the material used for the early temples was Piraic limestone—the material now commonly known as poros. It was, of course, completely covered with a coat of stucco, which was plain white on the columns and broader surfaces, but doubtless, like the marble, diversified in mouldings and other details with painted ornamentation.

The sculpture that served to decorate the early temples of Athens has also survived to a considerable extent. It consists chiefly of pedimental groups which belonged to the temples of which the architectural remains have just been mentioned, but it is not possible, in most cases, to assign it with certainty to one

¹ Unless the Ionic temple on the Ilissus, drawn by Stuart, was earlier; in any case it was not archaic.

or other of those buildings. The majority of these early pediments represent various exploits of Heracles. Amongst these are his fight with the Hydra, and his



EARLY PEDIMENT—HERACLES AND HYDRA.

On left Iolaus and chariot.

struggle with Triton, twice repeated; he was probably also one of the principal figures in other groups that are only partially preserved. The sculptors of the pedimental groups show a remarkable predilection for monsters with scaly and coiling tails, whether of snake or of fish—a predilection partly explained by



PART OF EARLY PEDIMENT—HERACLES AND TRITON.

the great convenience of these tails in filling the otherwise untractable space in either angle of the gable. The strangest of all these monsters has three

heads and human bodies which tail off below the waist into serpentine coils; and the three are so inextricably intertwined that they appear to form but one monster—an effect which is enhanced by the addition of two wings only to the whole, one on the outer side of each of the outer bodies. This creature has been identified, by a comparison with similar monsters on vases and with literary references, as a *τρισώματος Τύφων*. His antagonist has been variously restored as Zeus or Heracles. There are also two enormous snakes, of which the scales are worked out



TYPHON.

From an early pediment.

with the most detailed care, and which probably went to complete the Typhon pediment, and the Triton group which corresponds to it in size.¹ In addition to these there is a great group of two lions, or, as some would restore it, four lions, pulling down a colossal bull. Though the bull is fairly complete, the lions are fragmentary, and, in the absence of any

¹ I understand that Dr. Schrader attributes these two pediments to the Early Temple of Athena. As his arguments are not yet fully published, I cannot criticise them; but at present I find the attribution difficult to reconcile with the probable age of the temple. It is also difficult to conjecture what became of the groups between the erection of the peristyle and the Persian capture of Athens.



BULL AND LIONS.

certainly as to the general lines of the composition, it is difficult to decide whether it fitted into a pediment or not.

All these sculptures are executed in the same Piræic limestone as the early temples, and consequently they are commonly known as the sculptures in poros.¹ They all show more or less complete remains of the paint that once covered their entire surface, and these remains suffice to show us the general character of the colouring. It was highly conventional, dark blue, for example, being constantly used, not only for the hair and beards of men, but also for horses and for the body of the bull, while the rest of the distribution of the colour was decorative rather than naturalistic in character. The background was sometimes coloured, sometimes left plain, so that the coloured figures stood out against it like the black or coloured figures on the clay ground of early vases. The subjects and the composition of these early pediments offer many other analogies with vases, and especially with early Attic vases; and the same may be said

¹ French, *en tuf*.

of the artistic types. A good instance is seen in the heads of the Typhon, which have a good deal of resemblance, both in expression and in shape of eye and beard, to the heads of Heracles and Nessus on the large, early Attic vase. This resemblance is of importance, because it has been thought that the style of the poros pediments showed a dependence upon Ionic influence, by its similarity to certain classes of Ionic vases. Now that we find a similar style on vases in Athens, we need not look for any direct Ionic influence on the sculpture that adorned those early temples, any more than in their architecture. It seems more probable that we must recognise a vigorous local school of art in Athens about the earlier part or the middle of the sixth century B.C., which not only is visible in industrial products, such as pottery and decorative bronzes, but was also capable of building temples and decorating them with sculpture of an individual character.

Looked upon as sculpture, not merely as a decorative adjunct to architecture, the early poros groups have some merits and some defects. They are vigorous and original in composition, well adapted to the fields they have to occupy. The figures of which they are composed are full of life and action; their features, though somewhat uncouth, are full of expression; the forms of their bodies and limbs, though heavy even to clumsiness, are not ill-proportioned; even the position of muscles and sinews is appreciated and indicated, not indeed by correct modelling, but by shallow incised grooves. Perhaps

the finest piece of treatment of surface is seen in the bull; the wrinkles of his neck and the soft texture of his muzzle are indicated by curved lines and by close-set holes that suggest the technique of drawing or bronze-working rather than of stone. But, on the other hand, we miss entirely in these early Attic sculptures the conscientious study of detail, the refined and exact study




MAN CARRYING CALF.

of joints or hands or feet, that mark the progress of archaic Greek art when dealing with a few oft-repeated types, and working them gradually up to perfection. This defect may be due partly to the fact that we have here architectural sculptures, partly to the coarse material in which they are executed; but even in marble works of the same age, we see the same characteristics — for example, in the statue of a

man bearing a calf on his shoulders, which was dedicated, as its archaic inscription shows, in the earlier part of the sixth century. This statue is in the local Hymettian marble, a material little used for sculpture, and only here used experimentally. In the work we see the same life and vigour of effect, together with the same lack of precision and care in details.

The great change that comes over Attic sculpture

about the middle of the sixth century is probably to be attributed mainly to the influence of Pisistratus. Until his time Athens had been more or less isolated and more or less content with no very conspicuous position among Greek cities. His policy was to encourage the Panhellenic feeling among the Greeks generally, and to encourage social and artistic intercourse between the various states; and, above all, to raise Athens to a commanding position among her fellows, partly by giving a Panhellenic importance to the Panathenaic games, partly by encouraging literary and artistic enterprise. We have noticed the effect of his influence on the buildings of the Acropolis and lower city; he attracted to Athens, not only poets and literary men, but also artists, and particularly sculptors, from other centres of artistic progress. It was above all to the rising schools of sculpture in Asia Minor and the islands, already famous for the use they were making of the fine marbles of Naxos and Paros, that Pisistratus seems to have turned; we actually find on the Acropolis several bases of statues that attest, by the different alphabets used in their inscriptions, the presence of Ionic artists — among them men as well known as Archermus of Chios and Theodorus of Samos, representatives of the two families who made rival claims, according to the two traditions recorded by Pliny, to have originated sculpture in Greece. The presence of such artists and their pupils in Athens would be sure to have a great influence



upon the work of home sculptors. In the case of statues in Naxian and Parian marble, there is always room for doubt whether the marble was imported into Athens in rough blocks for the use of sculptors on the spot, or in the form of statues already finished, before export, by the hands of Naxian and Parian sculptors, near the quarries where the marble is found. Statues, both finished and unfinished, in Paros and Naxos, testify to the early skill of the local sculptors; in some cases, too, they may have accompanied the marble from their native islands to the places where there was a demand for their statues. Some modern authorities believe their influence and activity to have been very widespread, and have even gone so far as to attribute to them much of the architectural sculptures of Delos and Olympia; but the evidence hardly justifies so extreme a view. At present we are concerned only with Athens; and there, it is to be noted, the set of sculptors' names that occur upon pedestals of statues contain none which we can identify with certainty as those of Parian or Naxian sculptors, and none are written in the characteristic alphabets of Naxos or of Paros.

The earliest considerable work in imported marble which has been found in Athens is the pedimental sculpture from the early temple of Athena. This sculpture must be contemporary with the erection of the peristyle round the temple, probably by Pisistratus. The subject was the battle of the gods and giants. The central

group, which represented Athena transfixing a prostrate giant with her spear, is fairly well preserved, as are also two other recumbent figures, presumably of wounded giants, from the same composition. The style is in some ways intermediate between the earlier limestone pediments and the marble statues on the Acropolis. The composition is bold and vigorous, the expression on Athena's face lively, if somewhat crude. Her eyes are full and round; in the forms of the body and limbs of the giants there is much of the same character that we see in the limestone sculptures. The positions shown are more difficult, and sometimes, consequently, less successful; for example, the chest and arms of one of the giants are fairly correct, and also his legs, but the turn of the lower part of the body between the two is not clearly realised, and consequently quite falsely rendered. The finish in details is finer, doubtless owing chiefly to the superior material. A very similar group, both in style and subject, ornamented the pediment of the temple at Delphi, built by the banished Athenian Alcmaeonids shortly after the middle of the sixth century; and so we have a confirmation of the date to which the Athenian pediment must be assigned. A striking feature of the sculpture is the rich use of colour, especially in the large pendent ægis of Athena, which is decorated with a scale pattern that recalls the tails of the monsters on the earlier pediments.

The greater part of the sculpture in imported marble

on the Acropolis is not architectural, but forms a series of statues, most of them dedicated to Athena. The great majority of these are draped female figures; their exact significance is much disputed, and, very likely, was not much clearer to the dedicators themselves than it is to us. All we know is that the statues were officially called *κόραι* or maidens; that they were dedicated by men as well as by women, and that they could be offered to a god as well as to a goddess. An extreme example is offered by the inscription,¹


τήνδε κόρην ἀνέθηκεν ἀπαρχὴν Ναύλοχος ἄγρως
ἣν οἱ Ποντομέδων Χρυσοστρίαι' ἔπορεν,

where we notice, in addition to the other points already mentioned, that the "maiden" is offered as a "first fruits." This example violates almost every rule that has been formulated about Greek dedications, and shows that those rules, though they may be true in the main, are not to be strictly interpreted, and admit of exceptions. The reason why an offering took the form of a maiden is not easy for us to recover; what is most to our present purpose is to note that this form of offering was very common, and of practically universal appropriateness. The result, for us, is that we have, to illustrate the history of Attic art, a series of statues which is perhaps rather monotonous, repeating the same type over and over again with but slight variations; but which is, for that very reason, all the more instructive,

¹ *CIA.* iv. 1. 373. 9.



FEMALE DRAPED FIGURE.



since it allows us to trace the continuous development of sculpture without the necessity of allowing for variations of subject.

There are among these statues two or three that are evidently of foreign workmanship; but the rest show so many common characteristics, and so great a difference from series of the same type found elsewhere, — at Delos, for example, — that we cannot but regard them as the product of a single school; and it can hardly be maintained that this school is any other than the Attic. When, however, we compare the statues of this series with the earlier Attic works, the limestone pediments, for example, or even the marble pediment of the Old Temple of Athena, it is impossible not to recognise that a great change has taken place. The change is probably due, as we have seen, to the foreign artists who gathered round the court of Pisistratus.

The Attic art which grew under these influences in the latter part of the sixth century is more remarkable for refinement and delicacy than for strength. It delights in the rich folds of the complicated Ionic drapery, and in the varied details of an elaborate coiffure. The face and its expression are carefully studied; the round, open eye, which we still find in some of the earlier of the "maidens," gives way to a comparatively narrow aperture between the curved eyelids; the mouth substitutes for the broad, archaic grin of earlier times a subtly curved bow, not altogether free from affectation. The rich and lively effect produced by these statues is in great measure due

to the good preservation of their colouring, which has for the first time given us a clear notion of the application of colour to sculpture in early Greece. The fine material, and the traditions it has brought with it, have had their effect. The whole surface is no longer covered with an opaque coat of paint, as in the case of the rough limestone pediments. The change was probably facilitated by the custom of representing the flesh of women, and also sumptuous drapery, by a white pigment; to apply such a pigment over the surface of Parian marble would be "to gild refined gold." And, when the beauty of its texture, where exposed to view, was once appreciated, there would naturally be a tendency to leave as much as possible of it visible. We accordingly find that, in this set of "maidens," the use of colour is restricted within narrow limits. It is, in the first place, applied to the hair, the eyes, and the lips, the pigment used for the hair and lips being red, and the same for the iris of the eye, and usually for the outlines of iris and pupil; but a darker pigment is generally used for the pupil itself, and sometimes for the outline of the iris. It will be seen that this colouring is still partly conventional, certainly not naturalistic in character; but the red colouring on hair and iris is probably intended to represent an actual and admired type. The usual colour of the hair of the Tanagra statuettes is the same, and the red-brown eyes of the Delphi charioteer, itself probably an Attic work, will not easily be forgotten by those who have seen them. On the drapery we find similar principles of decoration.



FEMALE DRAPED FIGURE.

THE NEW
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATION

No garment is covered with a complete coat of paint unless only a small portion of it is visible. The main surfaces are always left white, showing the natural texture of the marble, but they have richly coloured borders, and are sprigged with finely drawn decorations, the colours used being mostly rich and dark ones — dark green, which was in some cases originally blue, dark blue, purple, or red. The effect of this colouring, whether on face or garments, is to set off and enhance by contrast the beautiful tint and texture of the marble. Those who have only seen white marble statues without any touches of colour to give definition to the modelling and variety to the tone can have no notion of the beauty, life, and vigour of which the material is capable.

The dress of the “maidens” shows a grace and elaboration that is in accord with the style of their sculpture. There are several varieties; but the majority are clothed after a fashion that may be classed as Ionian. This need not surprise us, when we remember the story told by Herodotus,¹ how, after a certain disastrous expedition to Ægina, the Athenian women set upon the sole survivor and stabbed him to death with their brooches; and how, in consequence, they were forbidden thereafter to wear brooches at all, but to adopt the linen Ionic chiton, instead of the Doric. This change must be assigned to the earlier part of the sixth century; on the François and other early Attic vases women wear the Doric chiton, with its large brooches on

¹ V. 87.

the shoulders. On the other hand, Thucydides¹ tells us that in his time the Ionian dress, with its linen chiton, had only recently been given up by old-fashioned people. Thus the prevalence of Ionian dress in Athenian



FEMALE DRAPED FIGURE.


fashion just about coincides with the period to which the statues we are considering must be assigned. The reversion to the simpler Doric dress seems to have taken place about the time of the Persian Wars, and it coincided with a tendency in art also to severer and more dignified forms. We can already see an anticipation of this improvement in some of the maidens who find their place in the series. One (p. 197), while differing from the rest rather in refinement and delicacy of modelling

than in type or artistic method, shows to what skill in marble technique the Attic sculptors had attained. Another (above), of simpler modelling, has succeeded in transforming the archaic smile into an expression that is not without charm and even fascination for many of those who see it. In these last two we may see, as it were, the culmination of the Ionic tradition, as inherited by Attic sculptors. But it was not this tradition unalloyed that led up to the masterpieces of the

¹ I. vi. 3.



HEAD OF FEMALE DRAPED FIGURE.



fifth century. Before we turn to the examples of a new and more severe influence, it will be better to notice some other classes of characteristic early Attic work. One of these forms, so to speak, a connecting link between the "maidens" and the decorative bronzes; it is a set of statues of flying Victories, such as are used on a small scale in bronze for the supports of boxes and other purposes; the type is familiar in marble from the Victory of Archermus on Delos, which, as the work of a Chian artist, shows that the Ionic schools, whose influence we have already noticed, here also gave the first suggestion. But the examples found in Athens show that here, too, the Attic artists had improved on their models, especially in the study of wind-swept drapery, which, if not always consistently treated, is rendered with both skill and delicacy. Another series, a set of horsemen that were probably dedicated by victors in the Panathenaic races, enable us to trace the gradual improvement in the rendering of the horse, the stages of preparation that were to lead up to the masterly treatment of the horse in the Parthenon frieze and pediments. One of the earliest of these is of a different nature; the rider is clad in a suit of many colours, with close-fitting trousers, such as are worn by barbarian archers on contemporary vases, one of which has just such a horseman with the inscription, *Μιλτιάδης καλός*. The date, of course, precludes any reference to the battle of Marathon, but the reference on the vase may well be to some youthful exploit of "the Tyrant

of the Chersonese"; and the statue may be dedicated to commemorate the same event. The scaly pattern on the rider's dress reminds one of the ægis of Athena on the early marble pediment, and the manner of treating and colouring the marble suggests that there is no



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

RELIEF OF THE NYMPHS OR HORÆ.

long interval of time between the two works. There are also many marble reliefs which show the same characteristics as the sculpture in the round. A good example is a representation of three dancing maidens, preceded by a flute-player and followed by a boy; the subject suggests later reliefs of the Nymphs or Horæ.

Marble statues or reliefs have been found elsewhere than on the Acropolis, and confirm the general estimate of Attic art that may be made from the Acropolis excavations. The best preserved of them come from tombs; an interesting fragment from a cemetery in central Attica consists of the basis with a funerary inscription and the feet of a statue which must have been similar to the "maidens" on the Acropolis, showing that the same type was used for monuments or tombs—a fact already attested in the case of the nude male "Apollo" type. The best known of all early Attic tombstones is that of Aristion, made by the sculptor Aristocles, which was for some time the cardinal monument of early Attic sculpture. From it Brunn,¹ with his usual insight, had inferred the characteristics that later discoveries have confirmed—a skill in composition, a harmony in the balance of mass and power, an impression of rest, without which the fineness of execution in detail loses its charm. We notice these same qualities in the finest—though not in all—of the recently discovered examples of Attic art.

Of sculpture in bronze we naturally have much less left than of sculpture in marble; indeed, the only part of a life-size statue preserved from early times, a very fine portrait head, is almost certainly of Æginetan, not of Attic, workmanship, and so does not concern us here, except as it shows that the Athenian Acropolis contained, even in the period before the

¹ *Gesch. d. g. Künstl.* I. p. 111.

Persian Wars, fine examples of other schools of sculpture than the Attic. Statuettes, on the other hand, have been found in considerable numbers, and show the same fine and delicate workmanship that we



FLAT DECORATIVE BRONZE RELIEF
OF ATHENA.



BRONZE STATUETTE OF ATHENA
PROMACHOS.

noticed in the decorative bronzes. Several represent various types of Athena; those which show her as Promachos, striking with her spear in raised right hand, her shield on her left arm, are among the most characteristic. An interesting and very charming example of the more peaceful type, without a helmet, is offered by a flat relief, similarly worked on both sides, that must have been affixed to a tripod or some other such object; this was also gilt. The types of

Athena and of other deities are also represented by a very numerous series of terra-cottas, both statuettes and reliefs, that have been found on the Acropolis.

Amongst all these dedications there are but few to remind us that there existed also in Athens, at the beginning of the fifth century, a flourishing school of athletic sculpture, represented in literary tradition by such names as Hegias, Antenor, Critius, and Nesiotes. There are, indeed, some bronze statuettes from the Acropolis, one of particularly fine workmanship, which may probably be of local origin; but for statues we are dependent upon copies. The most famous works of this athletic Attic school were the statues of the tyrannicides, Harmodius and Aristogiton, which were set up at the upper end of the Agora.¹ The first group, made by Antenor, was carried off by Xerxes, and returned to the Athenians later by Alexander or Antiochus; it was replaced immediately after 480 B.C. by another group made by Critius and Nesiotes, and it is of this latter group most probably that the statues now in Naples are the copies. They bear out Lucian's description of the works of these early masters, as sinewy and hard



BRONZE STATUETTE OF
AN ATHLETE.

¹ See p. 128.

and stiff in outline; but at the same time they show a splendid vigour in the impetuous rush of the two friends against the tyrant, and there is an impression of heroic size about them, due to the dignity and largeness of their proportions, and in strong contrast to the neat and compact figures of Æginetan sculpture. In the one head preserved, that of Harmodius, there is no




HEAD OF YOUNG MAN.

great advance toward freedom, though the affectation which we noticed in some of the Acropolis heads is avoided. For the finest example of a severer and simpler treatment of the face, due, no doubt, partly to foreign, probably Peloponnesian, influence, but adding to it all the Attic qualities of

delicacy and grace, we must again turn to a marble head from the Acropolis, that of a young man, which probably comes from an athletic statue. We may compare with this in style—though far behind it in beauty of execution—a small bronze head from the Acropolis, which might almost be an Argive work, and the upper part of a marble figure, which at once distinguishes itself from the rest of the “maidens” by



FEMALE DRAPED FIGURE, SHOWING SEVERER INFLUENCE.



the simplicity and severity of its modelling, by its prominent eyelids and the downward turn of its lips, as if in reaction against the archaic smile (p. 205). The head of a young man or ephebus shows these same characteristics, and has much in common with the head of the Delphi charioteer and the heads drawn on the severer of the red-figured vases, such as the finest of those made by Euphronios. It thus shows us, in a most pleasing form, just the stage reached by one branch at least of Attic art when the capture of Athens by the Persians destroyed the older dedications and made room for new; it also shows us the typical young Athenian who fought at Marathon and Salamis.

CHAPTER VI

THE ACROPOLIS IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

ἔστι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει ταύτῃ Ἑρεχθέος τοῦ γηγενέος λεγομένου εἶναι νηός, ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῳ τε καὶ θάλασσᾳ ἔνι, τὰ λόγος παρ' Ἀθηναίων Ποσειδώνᾳ τε καὶ Ἀθηναίῃν ἐρίσαντας περὶ τῆς χώρας μαρτύρια θέσθαι. ταύτην ὦν τὴν ἐλαίην ἅμα τῷ ἄλλῳ ἱρῷ κατέλαβε ἐμπρησθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων· δευτέρῃ δὲ ἡμέρῃ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπρήσιος Ἀθηναίων οἱ θύειν ὑπὸ βασιλέος κελευόμενοι ὥς ἀνέβησαν ἐς τὸ ἱρόν, ὧρων βλαστὸν ἐκ τοῦ στελέχεος ὅσον τε πηχυαῖον ἀναδεδραμηκότα. — Herodotus, VIII. 55.

THE tale of the sacred olive of Athena, and how it sent forth a shoot a cubit long but two days after it had been burnt by the Persians, may be taken as symbolical of the new growth of Attic art, that hastened to replace by nobler architecture and sculpture all that had perished at the hands of the invader. We have already seen how the walls of the Acropolis were renewed, and its outline extended to the symmetrical shape that formed a fitting frame for the treasures of art that it was to enshrine. When the Athenians returned to their desecrated citadel, they probably found but little left of the temples and statues that had stood upon it. And that little they made no attempt to restore or to preserve: some of it they buried, to fill up the enlarged terrace of the Acropolis; some of it they built into the

walls—notably the entablature and columns of the peristyle which Pisistratus had added to the chief temple of Athena. The first necessity was to provide the necessary accommodation for the sacrifices and other rites of the state. But we must remember that a temple was by no means the most essential thing for this purpose. Certain survivors of the Athenians—the same who told the tale about the sprouting of the sacred olive—had been ordered by Xerxes to perform the customary sacrifices immediately after the sack of the Acropolis; and they seem to have found no difficulty in doing so. The great altar of Athena was in all probability a rough mass of rock, which could be damaged by no conflagration; and all that was required for the due performance of a sacrifice was an altar and a precinct. Doubtless it was desirable also to provide a storehouse for the sacrificial vessels and implements, and, in time, for the sacred treasure which would soon begin to accumulate. But all this could be managed well enough with temporary buildings, and no immediate inconvenience would be felt. We do not know what became of the ancient wooden image of Athena, or how it escaped destruction when the temple was burnt; but it certainly survived, and must have been provided with some temporary shrine; but this may have been on a quite small scale. It is necessary to consider these conditions, because it is sometimes asserted that the Athenians must have restored the Old Temple of Athena, without its peristyle, to meet the

necessities of the state religion, and could not have waited without any great temple until the completion of a project that must have been expected to take many years. But, so long as a project for a more magnificent temple was in contemplation, the goddess might well be content that her old temple remained in ruins, since the regular worship in her honour was not hindered thereby. There is no sign in the extant remains to show that the early temple was ever restored; all its foundations remain below the level of the ground of the Acropolis after the Persian Wars; and, with the absence of any cogent argument of probability or convenience, all reasons disappear for supposing that it was rebuilt after its destruction by the Persians.¹ But as soon as the pressing necessity of restoring the walls of their town had been met, there is little doubt that the next thing they attempted was to build a larger and more beautiful temple to the patron goddess of their city. The bold scheme that commended itself to them for this purpose is worthy to have been originated by Themistocles himself, and all probability, though nothing of positive evidence, may be adduced in favour of the attribution. Instead of building the new temple where the old one had stood, or even choosing the highest conveniently level platform of the rock of the Acropolis, they selected a new and more commanding position, farther to the

¹ The evidence from inscriptions and other documents, put together with great ingenuity by Professor Dörpfeld in *Mittheil. Ath.* XII. and XV., is completely disposed of by Mr. Frazer, *J.H.S.* XIII. 156; and *Paus.* II. p. 553.

south; and as the rock failed them over half of this site, they decided to erect an enormous substructure to carry the new temple; in some parts of its southern side this substructure is as high as forty feet above the rock. In order to facilitate its construction, they built a rough supporting wall about thirty to forty feet away from its southern face; and as they added courses to the substructure, they filled up the space between it and the wall with earth and other rubbish, so as to have a solid ground to work on, and to save the necessity for a scaffolding. What they used to fill in this space between the wall and the substructure was, to a great extent, the débris of sculpture and architecture from the temples destroyed by the Persians, either on the Acropolis or in the town below; and it is from this place that much of the contents of the Acropolis Museum has been derived. The end of the wall may still be seen in a pit left for the purpose after the recent excavations, nearly opposite the western end of the Parthenon. Here it rests on a piece of the early Pelasgic wall, and a rough staircase is visible, evidently intended for the use of the workmen. The supporting wall was only for temporary use, and was never meant to show; it was buried deep below the ground when Cimon built the south wall of the Acropolis from the spoils of the battle of the Eurymedon, in 468 B.C.

For some reason the great temple was never finished according to its original design. The substructure was, however, practically completed, and the steps of the

temple were set in position on the top of it, and partially cut out of the living rock at the east end. Some of the drums of the columns were also prepared of Pentelic marble; indeed, this is the first clear example we have of



ROUGH TERRACE WALL AND STAIRCASE
SOUTH OF PARTHENON.

Pelasgic wall below.

the use of the material that was soon to become so famous. How much more was done we cannot tell, but it seems evident that the scheme was abandoned before the actual building of the temple had made much progress. We can only conjecture the reason for this proceeding, but there is much probability in the suggestion of Professor Furtwängler

that the scheme, being devised by Themistocles, naturally fell into disfavour at his disgrace and exile. After his ostracism, in 472 B.C., Cimon's influence became predominant in Athens, and with him more conservative views prevailed. It is true that he also contributed his share to the beautifying of the Acropolis, but, in addition to the personal feeling against Themistocles and his projects, there may well have been a reaction against

so complete a shifting of the position of the chief temple of Athena. In addition to building the south wall of the Acropolis, Cimon probably added the steps that led down through the north wall above the cave of Aglauros; and he also built a portico along this north wall just to the east of the steps, and terraced up the level of the ground here also, so as to match the more extensive changes of level that he had introduced in the southern part of the Acropolis. Whether he had any plans as to the great temple of Athena we have no evidence, but we can hardly imagine that the work begun by Themistocles would have been stopped unless some other project in honour of the goddess were substituted for it. It may be conjectured that Cimon's scheme was an anticipation of the Erechtheum, just as that of Themistocles was an anticipation of the Parthenon; but, if so, it has left no traces behind it. The ten years during which his power lasted were, however, so full of activity at home and abroad that he may well have had little opportunity for building the temple. By completing the walls of the Acropolis with the spoils of his victory over the Persians, he was fitting it to be that perfect dedication to the goddess that it was considered in later times; and there is another work almost certainly to be attributed to him, which was always among its most conspicuous monuments. This was the colossal bronze statue of Athena, which stood in the open a little way behind the Propylæa; it is said to have been dedicated from a tithe of the spoils of

Marathon; and it was appropriate for Cimon thus to set up a great memorial of the victory of his father Miltiades. But it may well have had a more general reference to the Persian Wars; the Athenians were always fond of taking their own great victory of Marathon as typical of the whole struggle. The statue has yet another interest for us, for it is the first recorded work of the sculptor Phidias. The foundation of the pedestal on which it stood may still be seen; it is most



ATHENIAN COIN.

View of Acropolis,
showing stairs,
cave, Propylæa,
colossal statue,
and Parthenon.

conspicuous in the views of the Acropolis that appear on late coins, and Pausanias tells us that the helmet and the tip of the spear—which were probably overlaid with gold—could be seen from the sea by any one approaching from the direction of Sunium. The statue may perhaps be identical with one that was destroyed in a riot at Constantinople in 1203 A.D., having been carried off from Athens and set up in the Forum of Constantine; and of this latter statue we have a rather rhetorical description by the Byzantine historian Nicetas. It was thirty feet high, and drapery and statue alike were of bronze. The right hand of the goddess, which was otherwise restored in the figure at Constantinople, must originally have rested on her spear; her left hand held together the folds of her drapery; she also had an ægis with a Gorgon's head, falling from her shoulders over her breast; the head and face were turned slightly

to the right. What Nicetas appears to have admired most was the grace and suppleness of the whole figure, the unrivalled beauty of the neck, which was long and bare, and of the tresses that showed over the forehead on either side of the helmet; incidentally, he mentions also that the veins were clearly rendered. With the help of this description, a type of Athena of which some examples exist in our museums has been identified as derived, more or less directly, from the colossal bronze statue of Phidias; though far removed from their original, they give us some notion of the simplicity and dignity of conception that distinguished it.¹

When Cimon was ostracised, in 461 B.C., he left the Acropolis terraced up and walled much as we see it now; but within it the great bronze Athena of Phidias probably kept watch over little but temporary store-houses and unfinished buildings. The first few years of Pericles' predominance in Athenian affairs do not seem to have been marked by any great architectural changes in the Acropolis. Probably he was occupied with political affairs at home and abroad; the greatest visible achievement of this time was the construction of the Long Walls from the Piræus to Athens, begun in 460 B.C. In this matter he was, in a certain sense, following and completing the policy of Themistocles, who had even gone so far as to advocate the migra-

¹ The statue is sometimes called Athena Promachos, but there is no early authority for the name, which properly belongs to a quite different type of the goddess, rushing forward to lead her followers into battle.

tion of the Athenians from Athens to the Piræus, in order to facilitate and confirm their naval supremacy. But Pericles could not have been content with such a scheme. He was occupied in developing that ideal Athens of which a masterly sketch is given in the speeches that Thucydides has put into his mouth. And this ideal city required, for its material counterpart, a sacred citadel, rich in religious and historic associations; if Athens was to be a liberal education to Greece, then its Acropolis must show all that was best in Greek sculpture and architecture. When Athens reached the zenith of her power, the Persian terror was felt no more; her fleet alone sufficed for a guarantee against any danger to the freedom of Hellas; and the treasure of the confederacy of Delos, originally intended as a protection against Persia, had been transferred to her keeping. While she was thus fulfilling her destiny as the champion of Greece against the barbarian, it was the aim of Pericles to vindicate for her a still prouder claim, and to make her practically the artistic and religious capital of Greece. Accordingly all the Greeks were summoned to meet in Athens, and to concert measures for restoring the fallen temples of the gods, as a thank-offering for their deliverance from the Persian invasion. The summons met with little or no response in the Peloponnese; but the members of the Delian confederacy had to a great extent become the tributaries rather than the equal allies of Athens, and their com-

mon treasure was devoted to the adornment of the Athenian Acropolis. Pericles called to his aid the sculptor Phidias, who had the chief direction of the work; with him were associated the architects Callicrates and Ictinus; and the people voted an expenditure that insured a rapid progress with the buildings



VIEW FROM NEAR TEMPLE OF NIKE.

In front, Pelasgic wall; on right, Propylæa; in distance, sea and Salamis.

which arose to fill the splendid frame that was provided by the victories and the munificence of Cimon.

The first of these buildings to be begun — though not probably the first to be finished — was the little temple of the Wingless Victory, or, to speak more accurately, of Athena Nike, which stands on the bastion to the south of the entrance to the Acropolis. An inscription, dating probably from about 450 B.C., has

recently been found, ordering the construction of a gate, a temple, and an altar of marble, according to the specifications of the architect Callicrates. The temple was seen still standing by Wheler, when he visited Greece in 1676; but it was soon after pulled to pieces and built into a Turkish bastion. Some of the slabs of its frieze were brought to London by Lord Elgin; and in 1835 the bastion was demolished, and the stones of the temple recovered and put together again on their original foundations by Ross, Schaubert, and Hansen; only a few portions had to be replaced by new pieces of marble; the missing slabs of the frieze were replaced by terra-cotta casts from the originals in the British Museum. The style of this frieze is difficult to reconcile with the early date at which the inscription has shown the building of the temple to have been ordered, and so it is probable that the completion of the temple, or at least the carving of the frieze, was postponed until after the Parthenon and the Propylæa had been built. Though the temple, as now restored, is rather patchy and ill-jointed when seen from near, it shows the same distant effect that it originally produced, and the visitor to Athens to-day, as in the fifth century, is still impressed by the grace of this little Ionic building, standing just in front of the great entrance to the Acropolis. It is interesting to know that the first building that one sees in approaching the Acropolis was also the first of the works projected by Pericles.

In 447 B.C., the work within the Acropolis was definitely begun, and, as valuable materials began to accumulate for the buildings to be erected, a practical necessity was a guard-house or police station, where three *τοξόται* could be stationed to prevent fugitive slaves or thieves from entering the Acropolis. Such a guard-house



PROPYLÆA FROM NIKE BASTION IN TURKISH TIMES.

From Stuart's *Antiquities of Athens*.

was accordingly ordered, again to the specification of Callicrates, who evidently was employed as architect to the state at this time, for he had also supervised the building of the Long Walls. At the same time the Parthenon itself, as we now know it, was begun in the place of the earlier temple, which had never advanced very far toward completion. The great substructure that

had been proposed for it was not indeed wasted; but it was not to be imagined that architects like Ictinus and Callicrates, to whom the design of the new temple was entrusted, would be likely to content themselves with the proportions that had been laid down by a predecessor. We do not know how the work was divided between them; but in all probability the perfection of the design is due to Ictinus, who wrote a book about the building, and was the more original and probably the younger of the two; Callicrates was associated with him because of his experience in the execution of great contracts for the Athenian state. The substructure was intended for a long and narrow temple, such as was customary in an earlier age. The temple designed by Ictinus was about fifteen feet shorter, and about six feet wider, and so gives exactly the proportion of length to breadth in the ratio of 9 : 4, which is far more symmetrical and pleasing to the eye. At the western end it was built so that its lowest step coincided in plan with the edge of the earlier substructure; and consequently the substructure projects at the eastern end the whole fifteen feet. To gain the additional width, it was necessary to enlarge the substructure on the north, where it rests almost immediately on the rock. The join in the work can easily be seen on the west face, where the piece built on by Ictinus consists of blocks of various sizes and materials, and evidently was not intended to be visible. This piece on the north was, however, made a little broader than was necessitated by the new proportions



THE PARTHENON FROM THE EAST.

The rock-cut altar is visible on the right. The small building in front is the circular temple of Rome and Augustus.

1887
7070
AND
THERMOCALORIMETER

of the temple, and the southern step of the temple was set a little back from the edge of the substructure, probably in order to arrange that the walls and rows of columns and other heavy masses of the new temple should be placed, as far as practicable, where the foundations had been strengthened to carry the weight of the corresponding parts of the old temple.



NORTH END OF WEST FRONT OF PARTHENON.

Showing added portion of the substructure, the step of the earlier design visible on the right.

The details of the Parthenon itself, both in architecture and in sculpture, must be reserved for a special chapter; here we are more concerned with its history and use. It was completed, at least so far as the main structure was concerned, by the year 438 B.C.; for then the great gold and ivory statue of Athena, that stood within it, was dedicated; but the decoration and finishing of details was still going on in 433 B.C., for we have

an inscription of that date referring to the work as still in progress. In 435 B.C. an important decree was passed, regulating the financial administration of the sacred and public moneys of Athens, including the Delian treasure. Among other things, it is enacted in this decree that the treasures shall be kept in the Opisthodomus, that of Athena being deposited on the right-hand side, and that of the other gods on the left-hand side; that the two boards of officials who are respectively responsible for these funds shall open and seal together the doors of the Opisthodomus; and that inventories and audits shall be made periodically both of these treasures and of other sacred property, and shall be inscribed upon stelæ set up in the Acropolis. Accordingly, we find from this time onward numerous inscriptions, some of them dealing with the audit of the treasures in the Opisthodomus, some with the inventories of the objects dedicated in the Prodomus, the Hecatompedos Neos, and the Parthenon; we actually possess these last three lists, continuous from year to year for some time, beginning with 433 B.C., the year after the decree just mentioned; and although we do not possess any record of the audit of the moneys in the Opisthodomus earlier than 418 B.C., there can be no reasonable doubt that they began in the same year as the others. A clear inference from these facts is that the Opisthodomus in question is the Opisthodomus of the Parthenon, which practically served, from the time of the completion of the building, as the public and sacred treasury or bank of Athens; it was, as we shall see in

the next chapter, admirably adapted to the purpose. Before the Parthenon was ready to be used, the sacred treasures were probably housed in some of the temporary buildings that have already been mentioned ; one of these is described in an inscription as being in the enclosure to the south¹ of the ancient temple of Athena in the Acropolis.

The Parthenon served, then, as a storehouse for the innumerable votive offerings dedicated to the goddess, so far as they were too precious or too fragile to leave in the open, and also as the bank of the Athenian state and of the Delian confederation. But its chief purpose was to afford a fitting house to the great gold and ivory statue of Athena Parthenos, and also, in itself, to summarise and represent all that was best in Athenian religion. There is no doubt that the intention of Pericles and his associates, in this and in other matters, was not only artistic, but also, in the highest sense, religious; but we know that they cared for the spirit more than for the letter, and that their more narrow-minded and formalist contemporaries accused them of sacrilege and atheism. The Parthenon was their crowning work; but we must remember that it had little, if any, direct relation to the orthodox and official worship of the state. The ancient wooden image still remained the visible idol of the goddess

¹ *πρόθεν* is the generally accepted restoration. Even if we read with Dörpfeld *ὀπισθεν*, the sense is similar; a building in an enclosure behind a temple cannot mean the Opisthodomus of that temple. For a summary of the whole question, see Frazer, II. pp. 556, 561.

and the centre of all state ceremonies; and it still remained without a worthy temple. In all probability Pericles had intended to transfer it to the Parthenon, even if he could not succeed in substituting for it the masterpiece of Phidias; but in this, as in other matters, he was defeated by the religious conservatism of his opponents, and his magnificent scheme for the honour of the goddess had, in one way, only succeeded in prolonging her homeless state.

After the completion of the Parthenon, the next undertaking of Pericles, begun in 437 B.C., was to provide the Acropolis with an entrance in harmony with the beauty of its walls and with the splendour of the temple that crowned it. We have seen that his first project was to build the little temple of Athena Nike on the bastion that flanked the entrance; his last was to erect the Propylæa; and the building itself, even in its present state, affords the clearest testimony to the political and religious difficulties that again thwarted his scheme. It is evidently incomplete in some respects; and Professor Dörpfeld has, by the most ingenious and convincing observations, recovered the original plan, and shown how and why it had to be curtailed. The plan, as first devised by the architect Mnesicles, was as follows. There was to be a great covered hall, divided into three aisles by rows of Ionic columns, leading up to five great doors of entrance, graduated in size, the central one corresponding to the central aisle. Beyond the doors,

toward the inside of the Acropolis, and also at the entrance of the hall, facing outwards, there was to be a portico of six Doric columns. The outer portico was to be flanked by two wings, projecting at right angles, and supported in front by three smaller columns and an anta at the end; behind each wing was to be a great



THE PROPYLÆA FROM SOUTH WING.

On left, temple of Nike; in middle, pedestal of Agrippa.

square chamber, that on the north side entirely walled in, that on the south side opening by a colonnade on to the bastion with the temple of Nike. The great portico that faced inward toward the Acropolis was also to be flanked by two porticoes of smaller columns, set parallel to it but a little farther back, and extending the whole breadth of the rock. These porticoes were to

form the front of great halls, which backed against the projecting wings of the outer front. A glance at the plan of the Acropolis will show the objections to which this bold and original scheme was open. The south-eastern hall would not only have occupied a large portion of the sacred precinct of Artemis Brauronia, but would have necessitated a very extensive cutting away of the rock of the Acropolis; indeed, if it were to have its proper effect, as seen from within the Acropolis, it would have been necessary to level away the whole of the Brauronian precinct. Again, the south-western wing and the hall behind it would have encroached considerably on the precinct of Athena Nike, and could not have been completed without demolishing her altar. Under these circumstances we cannot but wonder, not that such a project should have met with strenuous and successful opposition from religious conservatism, but that any architect should have had the audacity to propose a design which involved such rude desecration of some of the most ancient sacred places in Athens. We can only suppose that Mnesicles relied on the continued predominance of Pericles' authority to carry through his plans; for Pericles at least, and probably Phidias, too, must have approved of it. Possibly they may have had their own reasons for discrediting the worship of Artemis Brauronia, whom, with her bear dances and other relics of primitive savagery, they may have thought unworthy to share the honours of Athena upon her chosen hill.

The plan of Mnesicles had to be curtailed, and the Propylæa, though the pride of Athens and the admiration of all subsequent ages, remained in more than one sense unfinished. Not only were the religious objections maintained against certain portions of its extent,



PROPYLÆA FROM THE EAST.

but even what could be carried out never received a smooth finish either in walls or pavement; a rough panel is left projecting over most of these, spaces being smoothed to the final surface only at the corners and around the bases of columns. Outside the building, even the rough projections left to help the masons to get the blocks into position without chipping them may still be seen. These last signs of incompleteness are probably due to the fact that the building was still unfinished when, in 432 B.C., the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War diverted the Athenians from their architectural activity. But no such explanation will

account for the other abnormal features of the building. All that could be carried out was the central hall, with the five doorways, and the porticoes on each front, the north-west wing, and a portion of the south-west. Yet Mnesicles, although he must have been aware, while the building was going on, that he would not be allowed to carry out the rest of his plan, seems to have refused to alter the specification for these parts of the building in any detail, though they contained many features that are inexplicable in themselves, and can only be understood in relation to the missing portions. For example, the antæ that face north and south, near either end of the great eastern portico, are at present meaningless; they could have no purpose but to carry the end of an architrave running above the column fronts of the projected north-eastern and south-eastern halls. Nor are such features restricted to the ground plan, which, being laid out at the beginning, might have been difficult to modify later. High up in the walls are holes to carry the roof beams of the projected halls, and even an ornamental moulding is deflected, so as to allow for the slope of their roof. All these things show either that Mnesicles continued to hope against hope that the opposition to his design would be withdrawn or overcome by a new accession of the influence of Pericles in the state; or else that he must have clung obstinately to all that he could execute of the original plan, perhaps in the hope that some later generation would complete what he had begun, possibly

•

even with prophetic foresight that some architect of the remote future might recover from such scanty indications the grand design in which he took so much pride.

The problem of the south-western wing is more complicated; but here Professor Dörpfeld's conjecture as



PROPYLÆA FROM THE NORTH-EAST.

Showing unfinished work, and indications of projected north-east hall.

to the original plan of Mnesicles and its modification in execution fits the actual remains with an accuracy so remarkable as to carry conviction. This wing, as it stood throughout classical times, consisted of a rectangular hall, of which the east and south sides were continuous walls; but the south-east corner, where these walls join, is cut off obliquely, so as to be set as close

as possible on to the Pelasgic wall. The north face of this wing corresponded exactly to the south face of the north-western wing, consisting of three columns set between antæ; but this correspondence was produced in a very curious way. The roof of the hall did not extend beyond the third column, and its western edge was supported by a beam which rested on this column, and was carried on to the west end of the southern wall by the help of an intervening pillar. Thus the western anta of the north face is an irrational excrescence; it is merely added to make a sham front of the width required. Such a device is unparalleled in Greek architecture, and is utterly unworthy in one of the most beautiful buildings in design and execution that have ever existed. Its immediate purpose is, of course, to obtain apparent symmetry in the front view of the Propylæa; but we cannot suppose that Mnesicles would have attained the result in this extraordinary way if he had not been led to do so by the motives already suggested—either a hope of ultimately completing the building, or a spirit of indignant protest, one might almost say of pique, against the mutilation of his design. That the former explanation is the correct one in this case is practically demonstrated by the position of the south wall of this wing. As we have seen, the original plan contemplated a wing in this position corresponding in dimension with the north-west wing, but opening by a colonnade on to the bastion of Nike. The simplest way to have abridged this plan,

if its complete execution proved impossible, would have been to make the south-west wing correspond exactly with the front portion or vestibule of the north-west wing, omitting the square hall behind it; but this is not done, though it would have had the additional advantage of not encroaching on the Pelasgian wall at the south-east corner. The motive for placing the south wall where it is must be the following. As we possess all the stones of the south anta, and may assume that the intercolumniation of the western face was intended to be the same as that of the northern, we can ascertain exactly the position where the columns of the western face were to be placed; and it appears that the south wall would have stood exactly opposite to the second of them. It follows that the wall was placed here so as to harmonise with the original scheme if it should ever be carried out; and although in this one case we find Mnesicles introducing a modification into the practicable part of his complete design, we see that the modification is such as to confirm the opinion that he built all that he was allowed to build in direct relation to his larger plan.

In its details the building shows as great beauty and originality as in its general design. Perhaps the most striking feature in it is the use of black Eleusinian limestone¹ to vary the white Pentelic marble of which

¹ Sometimes incorrectly called black marble. It is not of crystalline texture, but is merely a darker variety of the blue limestone of the Acropolis at Athens. The Greek word *λίθος* is of course used for both stone and marble.

it is mainly constructed. The full effect of this choice of materials is difficult to realise now that both have weathered to tones that may scarcely be distinguished from one another by a casual observer; when both were freshly cut, the contrast must have been as striking as in the black and white marble of a Tuscan church.




PROPYLÆA: SIDE AISLE OF CENTRAL HALL.

Two of the doors and steps visible. Ionic columns on right; on left, dado of black Eleusinian stone.

The black limestone is used in the central hall for a dado along both side walls, reaching up to the level of the top step or the sill of the doors, which is also of the same material; it also occurs as a kind of sill course below the windows and the door in the north-western wing, and as the

bottom step of both the western projecting wings. The columns and entablatures of the Doric order are similar to those of the Parthenon; the Ionic capitals of the internal columns, though fragmentary, are the most perfect in form that are known. They are of the simpler

Ionic type, with a broad channel running across the top and simple volutes, and the fluting of the columns continues right up to the projecting moulding that crowns the shaft, with no intervening band of ornament. In these respects the Ionic capitals of the Propylæa differ from the more elaborate and



DETAILS OF IONIC ORDER (PRIENE).

decorated columns of the Erechtheum. But the outline of their volutes has a subtlety and precision that are unequalled. It is the same with the work in detail throughout; the joints, wherever the surface is finished, are so perfect as almost to have grown together; so that the whole building, unfinished and damaged as it is, must in many ways be considered the most perfect example of Greek architecture that we possess. It has been doubted whether the absence of sculpture from the pediments and metopes of the Propylæa is another result of the interruption of the

work, or is to be attributed to design; most probably the latter explanation is the true one. The position and use of the building favour simplicity, and its whole composition depends upon a combination of purely architectural lines which would lose in effect by the addition of sculptural decoration.

The completion of the temple of Athena Nike, and of the bastion upon which it stood, was a necessary adjunct to the building of the Propylæa; we have, however, no evidence of the exact date when this was done. The order for the erection of the temple was, as we have seen, passed about 450 B.C. The chief reason for believing that it was not finished until considerably later lies in the sculpture of the frieze of the temple, and of the balustrade that surrounded the bastion. These we must consider later; at present it concerns us to note that, while it is perhaps possible to assign them to a date earlier than the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, it is more probable that they were not made until some years later; perhaps they belong to the brief revival of religious and architectural activity that followed the Peace of Nicias. In addition to the completion of the temple and the balustrade, the work included the casing of the north side of the bastion with a veneer of marble, doubtless to make it match the marble structure of the Propylæa; the holes of the tenons for securing the marble slabs can still be seen. The slabs were probably cut to resemble courses of blocks of the usual size, just as the Piraic limestone of Cimon's wall, to which they are affixed, is cut to imitate

the regular structure of the rest of the wall, where it is in reality only a thin facing to cover the rough blocks of the Pelasgic wall behind. It is a curious coincidence that, in this bastion and the wing of the Propylæa immediately above it, the exigencies of situation or other conditions should have driven the builders repeatedly to use





BASTION AND TEMPLE OF NIKE FROM THE NORTH.

devices which appear at first sight unworthy of the simplicity and honesty of Greek architecture.

Though the Parthenon was probably intended by its builders to replace the old temple of Athena, destroyed by the Persians, as the chief centre of the state worship of Athens, the intention was never carried out, owing probably to a feeling of religious conservatism. The

ancient image of Athena, and the rites of which it was the object, thus remained without any adequate architectural provision, even after the most beautiful temple of antiquity had been built in the honour of the goddess. It would naturally devolve upon those who opposed the transference of the official cult from the ancient site to see that this deficiency should continue no longer to exist; and as it was Pericles and the war party that had been mainly concerned with the building of the Parthenon, the peace party, under the leadership of Nicias, may probably be credited with the project of building the Erechtheum, upon the actual site where the sacred symbols of Athena and Posidon were to be seen. Their opportunity for doing this most probably came when the Peace of Nicias, in 421 B.C., gave the Athenians a brief respite from the stress of the war. It is not known whether there was any earlier temple on the spot where the Erechtheum afterward stood; there are no visible rock-cut foundations or other traces of such a building; and it is perhaps more probable that the sacred well, the trident-mark, and the olive were originally out of doors in the precinct of the old temple of Athena, of which the foundations still remain, and not within any building at all; the olive, indeed, always remained outside in the Pandroseum. The work on the Erechtheum, after making considerable progress toward completion, appears to have been abandoned under the pressure of political and military disasters. But in 409 B.C., after the victory of Cyzicus had restored the naval supremacy of Athens and the





ERECHTHEUM FROM THE SOUTH-EAST.
In front, fallen columns of Parthenon.

renewed democracy had established order at home, it was resolved to appoint a commission to survey the state of the building, in order to note what was still required for its completion. We fortunately possess both the report of this commission and the accounts of the work that was consequently undertaken. From them we learn that almost the whole structure of the building was already standing before the commission began its work, and that many of the stones not yet in position were lying ready, or nearly ready, on the ground.¹ All that was left to do was

¹ Thus there was too little work left to admit of Professor Bury's suggestion (*History of Greece*, p. 498) that Cleophon started it to employ the indigent. Even if it were not so, the kind of labour required for the Erechtheum was far too skilled to be of any use to "the unemployed," except, perhaps, the making up of the terrace to the south and east of it.

to complete the top courses and roof, to flute most of the columns, to carve some of the ornamental mouldings, to give the final polish to the surface of the walls, and to carve the sculpture of the frieze. This work was probably completed during the following year; but in 406 B.C. we are informed by Xenophon that the ancient temple on the Acropolis was set on fire. This passage is generally supposed to refer to the Erechtheum, which though but recently finished may well be supposed to have taken, in popular speech, the name of the old temple which it replaced;¹ its official name was "the temple containing the old statue." We cannot tell how much damage was done by the fire, but it is unlikely that it destroyed the building entirely, any more than a fire in the Opisthodomus of the Parthenon, which happened sometime after the archonship of Euclides, destroyed the Parthenon. In this latter case the officials who were mainly concerned about the fire were the treasurers of the moneys kept there. So, too, in the Erechtheum, the damage may have been mainly to the contents of the temple, though it is probable that some injury may have been done to the roof and to the wooden fittings, and it is very probable that the engaged columns of the western end may have been so charred that, although

¹ The only other alternative is to refer the passage to the older temple, and suppose its cella was rebuilt after its destruction by the Persians. In addition to the obvious objection that if still standing in 406 B.C., it would have completely hidden the Caryatid Porch, we may note here that the chief purpose of restoring it would have been to give shelter to the old statue; and, if so, that statue would not have been already transferred to the Erechtheum in 409 B.C., when that building was still unfinished.

not requiring to be replaced immediately, they subsequently decayed and had to be renewed in Roman times. The damage was not repaired immediately, as Athens was already in the final throes of the Peloponnesian War; but an inscription¹ of 395-394 B.C., which almost certainly refers to these repairs, mentions that some of the damage to be made good was on the side of the Pandroseum, where these engaged columns stood; there are also signs of repair in the lintel of the great north doorway, which might easily have been cracked by a fire in the western end of the building. With the exception of these details, we may probably assume, in spite of the fire, that the building which we may still see on the Acropolis is the same that was erected by the Athenians during the intervals of the Peloponnesian War. The extreme crispness and clearness of the work in detail is an indication of a fifth-century rather than a fourth-century origin. But we must reserve our consideration of these details for their special chapter. Here we are concerned only with the history of the Erechtheum, which concludes, so far as we know it, the architectural history of the Acropolis during the fifth century.

We should, however, form a very inadequate notion of the appearance of the Acropolis at the close of the fifth century, if we confined our attention to the temples and other buildings that stood upon it. All the numerous votive offerings of an earlier age had also been broken

¹ *CIA*. II. 829.

or destroyed by the Persians, and the Athenians, on their return, did not trouble to repair them, but buried them to form part of the rubbish that terraced up the Acropolis. The only recorded exception is in the case of some statues of Athena, charred with fire, that were probably left to remind later generations of the Persian invasion, just as the smoke-blackened walls of some of the burnt temples were allowed to remain for the same purpose. Of the rest of the statues and other dedications seen by Pausanias when he visited Athens, the great majority were set up between the Persian Wars and the close of the fifth century. Of course he only professes to give a selection; but those which appeared to him, and would probably also have appeared to us, the most interesting belonged mostly to this period. We are able, therefore, to draw up a fairly extensive list of the statues that were dedicated on the Acropolis in the fifth century; in following this list we must allow ourselves the same right of selection that he allowed himself, and notice especially those of which, from Pausanias or other sources, we know more than the mere name.

The first votive offering seen by Pausanias on mounting to the Acropolis was that of the Athenian knights, — two equestrian statues placed upon pedestals at the extreme corners of the wings of the Propylæa, on either side of the entrance. The bases of these statues have recently been recovered; and as they have two inscriptions, which are set different ways upon the two sides of the basis, and also show signs of being recut at a later

date, there is some difficulty in ascertaining their exact history. The inscriptions show that they were dedicated by the Athenian knights, from the spoil of a successful exploit in which their leaders were Lacedæmonius, probably the son of Cimon, Xenophon, possibly the grandfather¹ of the historian, and Pronapus. The date of this exploit must have been about the middle of the fifth century; the statues were made by Lycius, the son of Myron. The hall that forms the back part of the north-western wing of the Propylæa was devoted to pictures.² We have a list of their subjects, and Polemo is said to have written a whole treatise upon them; but now it is difficult for us to realise what they were like. Some of them were by Polygnotus; the subjects were mostly from heroic legend, episodes of the Trojan War, and Perseus with the head of Medusa. There was also a picture recording the victory of Alcibiades in the chariot-race at the Nemean games; he was represented as seated in the lap of Nemea, and crowned also by personifications of the Olympian and Pythian festivals. This is a curious example of Greek allegory; but it is still more remarkable as showing the arrogance of Alcibiades; it is little to be wondered at that such a dedi-

¹ The name is not uncommon; but the names Xenophon and Gryllus seem to alternate in generations of the family; and Xenophon's interest in cavalry training and tactics may well be hereditary. The doubt expressed by Pausanias whether or no they are the sons of Xenophon, shows he must have jotted down on the spot the name *Ξενοφῶντος* from the inscription, and forgotten, or not noticed, the context; unless, indeed, he recorded the mistake of an ignorant guide.

² The name Pinacothēke, given it in some modern works, has no ancient authority.

cation met with disapproval as "fit for a tyrant and contrary to the law."

Within the Propylæa were several statues. One of Hermes Propylæus perhaps stood before the gate of the Acropolis much as the hermæ stood before houses. It has been conjectured with some probability that he may have stood in one of the niches formed by the projecting antæ on either side of the court of entrance. A relief of the Graces, said to have been made by Socrates, was also shown here; he is known to have been a sculptor in his youth, and such a relic of him might well have been preserved; there is, however, no ground for the identification of this work in any extant representation of the subject; it was valued, probably, for the sake of the author rather than for its artistic merit, and there are many examples of the type of various periods, some of them found in this region where there was probably an early shrine of the Graces. In the central hall of the Propylæa¹ was a bronze lioness made by the artist Amphicrates, and set up as a memorial of Leæna the courtesan. She was an associate of Harmodius and Aristogiton; but, though tortured to death by Hippias, she refused to disclose her knowledge of their plot. The Athenians, it is said, thinking her fortitude worthy of a monument,

¹ That the lioness, etc., were in the Propylæa is an inference from the position of the statue of Athena Hygieia mentioned below. This would naturally be the first thing seen on emerging from the Propylæa; but is quite possible that all were together inside the Acropolis, past the Propylæa, and that Pausanias saw them first before he turned back to look at the Athena, standing with her back to the columns of the front. It is impossible to decide this question.

but not deeming it fitting to dedicate a statue of such a person on the Acropolis, set up in memory of her a lioness without a tongue. Near by was a statue of Aphrodite by Calamis, dedicated by Callias; the basis may still be seen, but it has been moved to the eastern front of the Propylæa. This was probably the statue known as the Sosandra, selected by Lucian to give to his statue of ideal beauty some of its most graceful features. "Then," he says, "the Sosandra and Calamis shall crown her with modest courtesy, and her smile shall be noble and unconscious as the Sosandra's, and the comely arrangement and order of her drapery shall come from the Sosandra, except that she shall have her head uncovered." The quaint grace of this statue must have charmed the late Greek critics, just as an early Italian painting charms us at the present day. Still in the Propylæa was another statue of which we almost certainly possess a representation on a vase, and, very probably, also a marble copy. This is a statue of the general Diitrephes, who was represented as wounded by arrows. What is probably the basis of this statue has been found, though not *in situ*; its inscription shows that the Diitrephes in question was not, as Pausanias thought, the man who led the Thracian mercenaries in their brutal raid on Mycalessus in 413 B.C., but an earlier namesake, who fell in battle about 450 B.C.¹ The basis also tells us

¹ This is Furtwängler's suggestion (*Masterpieces*, p. 123), and is the most reasonable of the many hypotheses proposed.

that the sculptor was Cresilas, and it is extremely probable that this wounded Diitrephes was the famous "wounded and fainting man, in whom one can feel how little life is left."¹ On a lecythus of about the same period as the basis is a figure of a warrior, wounded with arrows, and staggering with his feet wide apart; and Professor Furtwängler has pointed out that the torso of a wounded warrior at Naples, if its modern restoration be removed, corresponds very nearly with the position of the figure on the lecythus, and also with the marks upon the basis. The style, with its vigorous and lifelike study of a wounded figure, yet far removed from the more dramatic and pathological treatment of Pergamene art, is just what we should expect from Cresilas. It would seem that the death of Diitrephes, either from its circumstances or from the way in which it was treated by the sculptor, made a great impression on his contemporaries.

Just beside the eastern front of the Propylæa there stands a basis, set against one of the columns, and bearing an inscription saying that the statue of Athena Hygieia which it bore was dedicated by the Athenians and made by the sculptor Pyrrhus. This statue was associated by tradition with an interesting story. It was said that one of the workmen employed on the Propylæa,² a favourite slave of Pericles, fell from the

¹ See *Gardner's Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, p. 318.

² There seems little reason to dispute the story because one variation says it was a temple on the Acropolis on which the man was employed. There are some other

building and was badly injured. But Athena appeared in a vision to Pericles and bade him make use of the herb parthenium, by the aid of which the man was cured; and Pericles in gratitude set up a statue of Athena Hygieia on the spot. The peculiar position of the pedestal, backing against one of the columns of the Propylæa, harmonises well with the tale; and the herb referred to, which is not what we call parthenium, but is known in modern Greek as *ἀνεμόχορτο* and in



INSCRIBED BASIS OF STATUE OF ATHENA HYGIEIA
BY PYRRHUS.

At the foot of a column of the Propylæa.

Italian as *erba de vento*, grows freely on the Acropolis, and especially in this part of it. It is still popularly used for medicinal purposes.¹ A little way in front of the statue is an altar, which faced away from the statue, and is one of several indications that there was a shrine at this spot to Athena, as goddess of healing,

difficulties pointed out by Wolters in *Mith. Ath.* 1891, p. 153; but on the whole the story seems well authenticated.

¹ I owe this information to Professor von Heldreich.

before the worship of Asclepius was introduced into Athens.

Between this spot and the entrance of the precinct of Artemis Brauronia were many dedications, of which the sockets may still be seen cut in the rock. Among these were the Perseus of Myron, a famous work of which some copies have been identified—but with no great degree of probability—among extant statues; and a boy with a bowl of holy water, by Myron's son, Lycius. Lycius seems to have excelled in what may be called religious "genre"; and this statue may probably have had a practical use, as providing the holy water usually placed at the entrance of an ancient precinct, as of a modern Roman Catholic church, for symbolical ablution. It may have served this purpose for those entering the Brauronian precinct—or, possibly, for those entering the Acropolis itself.

Beyond the steps that led up to the Brauronian precinct, the main path led along the northern side of the Parthenon toward its eastern front, and was bordered on each side by rows of statues and other offerings. First came a colossal bronze image of the wooden horse of Troy, by the sculptor Strongylion—a work probably alluded to by Aristophanes in the *Birds*;¹ the Greeks were peeping out of its side, among them the Athenian heroes being naturally the most prominent. Then there was a statue of Epicharinus as a runner in the armed race; a fine subject for Critius and Nesiotes,

¹ l. 1128.

whose work we know in the Tyrannicides. Two other statues honoured the prowess of Hermolycus the pancratiast, who was awarded the prize for the most distinguished valour in the great victory over the Persians at Mycale, and of Phormio, whose brilliant naval victories over greatly superior numbers off Naupactus form one of the most exciting episodes of the earlier years of the Peloponnesian War. Then there was another work of Myron's, of which we have several copies; it represented Athena throwing away in disgust the flutes that had distorted her face, and the satyr Marsyas, who, while approaching to pick them up, starts back in astonishment, perhaps at the goddess' indignation. The statue of Marsyas is second only to the Discobolus as an example of the sculptor's characteristic achievement—the expression of violent motion as implied in the moment of rest that precedes or succeeds it. On the other side of the path¹ was a row of heroic subjects of which we have no very definite information—Theseus and the Minotaur, Phrixus sacrificing the Ram with the Golden Fleece, and the infant Heracles strangling the serpents. Then, about opposite the two ends of the Parthenon, were two groups that reproduced the subjects that were treated in the two pediments of the building,—the birth of Athena from the head of Zeus, and the contest of Athena and Posi-

¹ Professor Dörpfeld has suggested (*Mith. Ath.* XII. p. 53) an ingeniously symmetrical arrangement of these offerings, from Pausanias' list; it is rejected by Miss Harrison (p. 528, Note 68) on the ground that Pausanias purposes to give only a selection, not a complete list.

don for the land of Attica, she producing the sacred olive as her gift, and he a salt spring. Each of these groups seems to have been set, not opposite the pediment with the same subject, but opposite to the other one. The second, at least, which is probably reproduced on certain coins and a relief, varies considerably in treatment from the pediment: it represented Athena and Posidon standing in friendly colloquy, on either side of her olive tree. The historical relation of the groups to the pediments is not easy to establish; but it



ATHENIAN COIN.
Group of Athena,
Posidon, olive
tree, and snake.

seems improbable that after the completion of the Parthenon and the universal acknowledgment of its perfection, variants of its two chief groups of sculpture should have been set up beside it. It is perhaps more probable that they were alternative compositions for the central groups, prepared at the time, very likely in one of those competitions which we know to have been not uncommon on such occasions. It is a tempting suggestion that the tale of a competition between Phidias and Alcamenes for a statue of Athena to be set up above columns is to be referred to the models for the Parthenon pediments, and that the rejected designs of Alcamenes were set up on the Acropolis beside the Parthenon, as being worthy of preservation.¹ Close by was another work of Alcamenes, Procne with her child

¹ I am not sure if this rather obvious suggestion has been made by any one else; it is hinted at in my *Handbook of Sculpture*, p. 311.

Itys. This work is perhaps preserved to us in a statue of a draped female figure with a boy leaning against her, which was found on the Acropolis and may still be seen there.¹ The style of the statue is in accordance with what we know of Alcámenes, though the execution is hardly such as we should expect in an original by one of the great masters of antiquity. A work by another of the companions of Phidias, Cleætas, was noted for the delicacy of its finish; it represented a helmeted man, and the finger-nails were inlaid with silver. Cleætas was evidently one of the most skilful craftsmen of his time, for he was also employed to make the gold and ivory table that held the wreaths for the victors at Olympia. To the north-west of the Parthenon, near the great altar of Athena, was the statue of Zeus Polieus, — an archaic, striding figure, as we learn from coins, — and the altar of the god, which was the centre of the strange ceremony of the sacrifice at the Dipolia. On this occasion, those who had assisted in the sacrifice shifted from one to another the responsibility for the death of the ox, until at last the axe or the knife was found guilty and thrown into the sea; then the ox-hide was sewn together and stuffed. The guilt of murder in the sacrifice and the fictitious resurrection of the victim are evidently survivals from a very primitive stage of ritual.

The official inventories give us very complete lists of the votive offerings to be seen in the various com-

¹ *Antike Denkmäler*, II. 22.

partments of the Parthenon; they naturally consisted of smaller, more perishable, or more precious objects, such as could not be left in the open. It will be best to leave these for the more detailed description of the Parthenon itself in the next chapter, and to continue with what was to be seen outside the temples. Proceeding from the Parthenon toward the southeast, in the direction of the modern museum, we notice first a statue said to be by Phidias, Apollo Parnopius, the locust god; unfortunately we have no means of identifying the type, either from artistic or from mythological evidence. Here, also, were more statues of well-known men, including Xanthippus, the father of Pericles, who distinguished himself also as a general by leading the land force at the battle of Mycale, and the poet Anacreon, who was represented, according to Pausanias, as "singing like a man flushed with wine." Of this last statue we probably possess some copies, which show the dignity with which such a subject could be treated in the fifth century; the poet is standing, with his head thrown back in lyric as well as Bacchic enthusiasm.¹ We do not know what buildings occupied the eastern end of the Acropolis, but there seem to have been few noted offerings set up in this region; probably there were some storehouses, of which the foundations still remain and have been partly used for the modern museums. Near the Erechtheum our list of offerings begins again; there

¹ Brunn-Bruckmann, *Denkmäler*, 426.

was a seated figure of Athena by Endœus, which, if not to be identified with certainty as a statue actually discovered, must have been very like it. Adjoining the Erechtheum on the west was the open court of the Pandroseum, with the sacred olive of Athena growing in it, and below it the altar of Zeus Ἐρκεῖος, probably a survival from the palace of Erechtheus. The space to the west of this, between the foundations of the peristyle of the old temple and the north wall of the Acropolis, was probably taken up by the dwelling-house and playground or tennis court of the maidens known as the Errhephori, who lived in the service of Athena here for a year, and, at the end of it, carried a box which they might not open down a mysterious cleft in the earth near the Ilissus.¹ On the other side of the Erechtheum, the platform on which the old temple once stood offered an excellent space for setting up votive offerings, and we accordingly



EARLY SEATED STATUE OF
ATHENA.

Possibly by Endœus.

¹ It is sometimes suggested that this is identical with the cleft through which the Persians ascended (see p. 47); but the words of Pausanias show that the cleft in question was not one by which the maidens descended from the Acropolis to the shrine near "the Gardens," but a cleft *in* that shrine. It seems probable that the shrine in question may have been that of earth (Ge-Olympia), and the cleft may be the same one by which the waters of Deucalion's deluge were said to have disappeared.

find another continuous row extending down to the north of the entrance through the Propylæa, and corresponding to the row we have already noticed, stretching from the south of the entrance up to the Parthenon. Close to the Erechtheum were the early charred images of Athena left as a relic of the Persian Wars. There were two groups of warriors facing one another in combat, such as are familiar to us in the Æginetan pediments; one of these represented Heracles and Cynus; the other, of Erechtheus and Eumolpus, may perhaps be identical with Myron's Erechtheus,¹ one of his most famous works; there were, as we have seen already, several other works by Myron in this neighbourhood; among them was his famous heifer, a marvel of realistic animal sculpture, if we may judge from the numerous epigrams that were written about it. Here, too, was a statue of the Athenian general Tolmides, who distinguished himself when the empire of Athens was at its height, and fell at Coronea in 447 B.C. There were also representations of some of the exploits of Theseus, — his finding of his father's shoes and sword beneath the rock where they were hidden, and his capture of the Cretan bull. A statue that it may surprise us, as it surprised Pausanias, to find upon the Athenian Acropolis is that of Cylon; for although he was a victorious athlete, his disastrous attempt at tyranny forfeited any claim he had to commemoration by the citizens. The most probable explanation is that the

¹ So Michaelis, *Myth. Ath.* II. p. 85.

statue was set up to expiate the violation of the sanctuary of Athena by the massacre of his accomplices. His statue was set up close to the colossal bronze Athena of Phidias. Just to the north-east of the Propylæa was a memorial of one of the most brilliant victories in the history of the Athenians, when they defeated the Bœotians and the Chalcidians in two battles in a single day in 507 B.C. It was a four-horse chariot in bronze, made from a tithe of the ransom of the prisoners they took, whose fetters were still to be seen in the days of Herodotus, hanging on the smoke-blackened remains of a wall close by.¹ The inscription of dedication on the pedestal, which has been found, dates from shortly after the middle of the fifth century; doubtless the original statue and basis were destroyed or carried off by the Persians, and new ones were set up when the Athenians were making claim to supremacy over those they had conquered before.

In addition to the numerous dedications there were many official documents, such as decrees or treaties, which were interesting not only for their contents, but also for the reliefs which were often carved above them. One of these showing Athena and Hera clasping hands, as a symbol of the alliance of Athens and Samos, may be taken as typical of its class.

¹ There is no difficulty in understanding Herodotus' words *ἀριστερῆς χειρὸς πρῶτον εἰσὼντι ἐς τὰ Προπύλαια* as meaning "on the left as you enter the Propylæa," i.e. within the Acropolis, where Pausanias saw it. We must remember that the Propylæa seen by Herodotus were not the elaborate structure we know, but a much simpler gateway.



HEADING OF A TREATY BETWEEN ATHENS AND
SAMOS.

Hera and Athena.

Last come two dedications which are among the most interesting of all; one of them the statue of Athena, called the Lemnian, according to Pausanias, from those that dedicated it — perhaps the Athenian colonists who were sent to occupy the island about the middle of the fifth century; in any case the mytho-

logical type was probably one which they found there, and which subsequently, as Athena Hephæstia,¹ became popular in Athens. It represented Athena in her more human aspect, as goddess of the arts of peace. The statue was by Phidias, and was counted by many as the most beautiful of all his works; the excellent critic Lucian concurred in this judgment, and chose from the Lemnia, for his ideal statue, "the whole contour of the

¹ Hephæstia is the name of a town in Lemnos; an adjective formed directly from the name of one divinity is never applied to another.

face, the softness of the cheeks, and the fair proportions of the nose." Professor Furtwängler believes he has identified copies of this statue at Dresden, and also in a very beautiful head at Bologna; and, although his identification has been disputed with good reason by some authorities, it has met with a considerable degree of acceptance.¹ This statue was admirably placed, for any one entering the Acropolis through the Propylæa would see on his right, dominating the whole hill, the Parthenon, which held the gold and ivory statue of Athena Parthenos; in front of him, the colossal bronze figure that was conspicuous even from the sea; and, nearer at hand,



PORTRAIT OF PERICLES.

Probably after Cresilas.

¹ I have stated my own opinion on the matter elsewhere, and I think the objections are very strongly put by M. Jamot in *Monuments Grecs*, Nos. 21, 22. However, I cite the Bologna head here as a concession to a theory admitted by many archaeologists.

on his left, this Lemnian Athena. He would thus be reminded at once of the three aspects of Athena embodied in these famous statues by Phidias. And, most appropriately, there was placed close beside the Lemnian goddess the portrait of Pericles, to whom more than to any other man was due the unrivalled series of buildings and of statues that glorified the Athenian Acropolis. The portrait was by Cresilas, and was quoted in antiquity as an example of the wonderful way in which art could "add to the nobility of noble men"; it is an example of the idealising tendency of the fifth century. The copies of it that have survived show us the character of Pericles much as it has been sketched for us by Thucydides; but we feel in both versions that it is not so much accidental and individual features that are portrayed, but rather the calm and moderation of the ideal statesman, under whose leadership the democracy became practically the rule of a single man. His portrait was rightly the first to be seen on entering, the last on leaving, the Acropolis; but its pedestal instead of an honorary inscription such as a later age would have delighted to elaborate, bore simply the words, "Pericles; made by Cresilas" (Περικλέους · Κρησίλας ἐποίη¹).

¹ The genitive is unusual, but hardly suffices to cast doubt on the identification of the herm.

12



THE PARTHENON FROM THE NORTHWEST.
In front, rock-cut steps.

CHAPTER VII

THE PARTHENON

THE circumstances under which the Parthenon was built have already been stated; but before we can proceed to a more detailed study of this building, which is in itself a summary of all that is best and most characteristic in Greek architecture and sculpture, we must take a brief survey of its subsequent vicissitudes; for there is none of them that has not left a trace upon the structure or upon its decoration.

The Parthenon, as we have seen, must have been practically complete by the year 438 B.C.—at least complete enough to allow of the dedication of the great gold and ivory statue of Athena Parthenos that stood within its cella. During the succeeding centuries, though in some instances accident or pillage may have affected its contents, the building itself appears to have remained unscathed. Its most serious recorded danger was from a fire which occurred in the Opisthodomus shortly after 404 B.C.; the treasurers of Athena and of the other gods were imprisoned on account of this fire, which probably destroyed their public accounts; but it does not appear to have damaged the fabric of the

building. Plutarch remarks that the Parthenon in his time was in such excellent preservation that it might have been only recently built. It is said that in the fifth century of the Christian era, the statue of Athena Parthenos was removed from her temple.¹ It is not certain whether the Parthenon was at once changed into a church, though there is a tradition which has gained acceptance rather from its appropriateness than from the evidence on which it rests, that the temple was, when first converted at this time to Christian use, dedicated to the "Wisdom of God" (*Ἁγία Σοφία*)—a fitting successor to the Goddess of Wisdom. However this may be, in the sixth century, when the Greek religion was officially abolished by Justinian, the Parthenon was certainly transferred from the worship of Athena to a new cult; and during the succeeding centuries we find it dedicated to the Virgin Mother of God (*Θεοτόκος*).


The adaptation of the temple of Athena to Christian uses involved considerable structural alterations. In the first place the temple, as was usual in Greece, had its principal entrance at the east end, and the cella containing the great statue faced in this direction. The church, on the other hand, had to be entered from the west; the square chamber to the west of the cella formed a convenient narthex, and three doors were cut through the transverse wall to give communication between it and the cella. At the east end was the holy place (*ἅγιον*

¹ There is little authority for the statement that it was carried off to Constantinople.


βῆμα), separated from the body of the nave by an eikonostasis or screen; behind this, again, was built an apse, to hold the seats for bishops and clergy. This apse, of which the traces may still be seen in the floor, was fitted into the great eastern doorway of the temple; and, to make room for it, not only the jambs of the door, but also the nearest columns of the pronaos had to be cut away. To the same cause is probably to be attributed the removal of the central slab of the frieze, above the door; but this slab was preserved, and was still to be seen a thousand years later, behind the door of the church. Other portions of the sculpture were not so fortunate. The original internal columns of the Parthenon, and the roof which they supported, were taken away; and there were substituted for them a set of smaller columns, supporting galleries and a vaulted roof. It was probably the erection of this roof that caused the destruction of the central portions of the eastern pediment. It is improbable that this destruction was intentional, for the central group of the western pediment, which was just over the chief entrance of the church, remained practically intact for another thousand years; and the figures of the eastern pediment, which are irretrievably lost, were at the back of the church in a comparatively inconspicuous position. But the back walls of both pediments were broken away in the middle, and brick structures, with niches or arches, were substituted.¹ The roof over the peristyle appears not to

¹ See illustration, p. 294.

have been renewed; and consequently the frieze at the sides has suffered considerably from exposure to the weather. There is little more to record about the Parthenon until comparatively modern times. Its church changed from the Greek to the Latin rite under the Frank and Venetian Dukes of Athens; and then again to a mosque under the Turks, who captured the city in 1456; but it remained practically unchanged, except for the addition of a minaret, until the visit of the travellers Spon and Wheler in 1676, and of the artist Carrey, who in 1674 was employed by the Marquis de Nointel, French ambassador in Constantinople, to make drawings of its sculpture. These drawings are now of inestimable value to us, for only thirteen years later came the disaster that reduced the building to its present state. A Venetian army under Morosini came in 1687 to besiege the Acropolis, and deserters gave information that the Turkish defenders had made the Parthenon into a powder magazine. Accordingly it became the target for the Venetian artillery, and on the 26th of September a bomb fell within the cella and exploded the powder. The north and south sides of the building were blown out, walls and columns alike, leaving a terrible gap in the midst, but the two ends still remained standing; the west end, being more distant from the centre of the explosion, and being also protected by the transverse wall, was least injured. Thus the west pediment again escaped accidental destruction, but this time only to fall, with more fatal results, into the hands of



J. H. MIDDLETON.



the admiring but unskilful connoisseur. Morosini wished to carry off the chariot and horses of Athena as a trophy; but his attempt to lower them from their place only resulted in a fall which shattered them to pieces.

From this time on the work of destruction was slow but sure. The fanatical or wanton destruction of the Turks and the indifference or powerlessness of the



THE ERECHTHEUM IN TURKISH TIMES (PARTHENON ON LEFT).

From Stuart's *Antiquities of Athens*.

Greeks combined with the acquisitive curiosity of Frank travellers to deface or carry away such of the sculptures as were accessible. But a new era began with the visit of Stuart and Revett to Athens in 1751; for their careful drawings of the monuments of Athens, and especially of the Parthenon, may be said to have laid the foundation of a systematic and scientific study in addition to attracting the attention of educated men in the West to the architecture and sculpture that Athens

still had to show. A not unnatural consequence was the notion of transferring bodily some portion of these treasures to a place where they would meet with better protection and appreciation. The Marquis de Choiseul-Gouffier, a worthy successor of de Nointel as French ambassador to the Porte, took up this scheme; and at his direction, Fauvel, the French consul at Athens, actually had some pieces of sculpture removed from the building. But it was reserved for Lord Elgin to carry out the scheme. When he was appointed ambassador to the Porte in 1799, his attention was called to the imminent danger of destruction under which the Athenian sculptures lay; and he accordingly despatched the Italian artist, Lusieri, with a staff of assistants, to draw and make casts. In 1801 the defeat of the French in Egypt left England paramount in the Levant, and Lord Elgin took advantage of the opportunity to obtain a firman authorising him to pull down extant buildings where necessary, and to remove sculpture from them. The first result of this was the demolition of the Turkish houses which we see in Stuart's drawing¹ surrounding the Parthenon, and the discovery in their foundation of many fragments of the pediments and of other sculptures; but the permission was also interpreted to allow the removal of sculpture from the Parthenon itself, and, as a consequence, a great part of the sculpture which was still left on the building came to be carried off to England. The abuse that

¹ See p. 261.

was showered on Lord Elgin for this proceeding by Byron and others, mainly on sentimental grounds, will not bear the test of sober criticism. The only shadow of justification that can be found for it lies in the fact that Lusieri's workmen, though they did no damage to the sculpture, were not so careful of the building as they might have been; in particular, they threw down some blocks of cornice to get out the southwestern metopes. But they left on the building such sculpture as appeared to be adequately protected from the weather or other damage; and a comparison of the casts they took at the time with the present condition of the sculptures left behind shows that they erred, if at all, in taking away too little and not too much. After many delays and difficulties the Elgin Marbles were brought to England,¹ and finally acquired by the British Government to be deposited in the British Museum, in 1816.

A study of the Parthenon must take into account the Elgin Marbles in the British Museum, and scattered fragments of its sculpture in the Louvre, Copenhagen, and elsewhere, as well as the building itself on the Acropolis, and such portions of its decoration as are preserved in the Acropolis Museum. With the help

¹ One of the ships chartered by Lord Elgin was wrecked off Cerigo, but its whole cargo was recovered at great expense. Of course the ship laden with sculpture, discovered by divers off Cerigo in 1901, has nothing to do with this. It was a Roman ship with a cargo of miscellaneous bronze and marble statues. The proposed identification, which unfortunately gained some currency, could not have been thought possible by any one acquainted with the facts.

of all this evidence, let us endeavour to realise the appearance of the Parthenon as it was when first dedicated in 438 B.C., and as it remained for nearly a thousand years after that date.


The plan of the building was peristyle amphiprostyle; that is to say, it had a portico of six columns projecting at front and back, and in addition to them a colonnade which surrounded the whole building, with eight columns at the front and back and seventeen at the sides. Its chief peculiarity lies in the existence of a large square chamber behind the cella, entered from the back of the temple. This chamber was called the Parthenon in the narrower sense; indeed, the name was not transferred to the whole building until later times. The arrangement was probably an inheritance from the early temple or Hecatompodon,¹ which had a similar chamber at its back; in both cases the chamber appears to have served as a treasury. The Parthenon, according to its earlier design, was to have been considerably longer, and this may have been due to an intention to include in it also two small chambers like those in the Hecatompodon. By their omission it was possible to follow the tendency of the age to give temples a shorter and wider plan, and this consideration was doubtless paramount with the architect Ictinus, who designed the temple in such a manner that the length and breadth, measured along the upper step, are exactly in the ratio of 9:4. The cella was of ample proportions, and was

¹ See p. 80, above.



INTERIOR OF PARTHENON, LOOKING WEST.

The west door and the outline of the intercolumniation clearly visible.



entered through a great door at the eastern end; a similar door at the west end led into the Parthenon. These doors both show on their jambs the sockets for wooden casings, perhaps coated with bronze, which here, as in the Propylæa, survive in marble walls as a reminiscence of the time when walls were built of unbaked brick, or other inferior material, and required such a casing to protect them. There was no communication between the cella and the square chamber behind it; the plain wall that separated them was not pierced with the doors of which the traces are now to be seen, until the temple was changed into a church. The cella was surrounded by an internal colonnade, at the back as well as on both sides; the traces of the columns, and even the outline of their flutings, may still be seen on the pavement, though they are to some extent obscured by the traces of the later and smaller columns that carried the gallery and vaulted roof of the church. They could not, from their size, have reached to the roof, but must have supported an entablature, and possibly a gallery, on which rested another tier of smaller columns. Standing clear of this inner colonnade, and almost exactly in the middle of the whole temple, was the pedestal of the colossal gold and ivory statue of Athena, which stood facing the great door. The place of the pedestal is marked by a gap in the marble pavement, filled with blocks of Piræic limestone; the space immediately in front of the statue was railed off, as at Olympia, by a balustrade of which the line may still be traced on the pavement.



INTERIOR OF PARTHENON, LOOKING EAST.

The dark patch in the middle of the pavement is the site of the basis of the statue.

The question of the lighting of Greek temples generally, and of the Parthenon in particular, has been much discussed. The old view, that there was a square opening in the roof of the cella, and that the temple was what is called hypæthral, or "open to the sky," is now generally discredited; it probably arose, as Professor Dörpfeld has shown,¹ from a misapplication of a passage in Vitruvius. It is evident that in a variable climate like that of Athens so delicate a work as a gold and ivory statue could not have been exposed to the weather, and no curtain or hanging, such as has been suggested, would have sufficed for its protection, especially since it is now known that the statue stood out in the middle of the cella, not in a niche at the back of it. Mr. Fergusson's suggestion of a sort of clerestory, admitting

¹ *Mon. Ath.* XVI. 334.

through the topmost row of the internal columns¹ the light which enters through openings in the roof above the side aisles, is free from the objections that seem fatal to the "hypæthral" theory, and must be acknowledged to be very ingenious. But it is not supported by any clear example of such an arrangement in any known building of classical times, and it is difficult to believe that so convenient a device, if present in so famous a temple, would not have left some trace elsewhere. Moreover, such means of lighting is perhaps superfluous in the case of the Parthenon. In the first place, the interior need not have been very brilliantly lighted; so gorgeous a piece of work as the gold and ivory statue would probably look best in a subdued light; and the light entering through the great eastern door—or rather through the central intercolumniation of the east front—would have sufficed, when reflected from the white marble pavement and walls, to give a very fair illumination to the cella. In this way, too, a very impressive effect would be obtained on the festival of the goddess, when, owing to the special orientation of the temple, the rays of the rising sun would fall directly on the statue. The light that entered through the door was probably supplemented also by that which penetrated through the roof. The tiles were made of Parian rather than Pentelic marble, probably because of its superior transparency. Thin slabs of marble are sometimes used to this day in Byzantine churches to fill the windows instead of glass;

¹ Fergusson restores three tiers of internal columns.

and the proud boast of Byzes of Naxos, "that he was the first to make tiles of marble,"¹ may well imply that he was the first to solve the difficult problem of the lighting of the interior of temples; so long as they were small the door sufficed, but when they grew larger the need for some such device may have made itself felt. A temple like the Parthenon doubtless had an inner ceiling of wood, probably flat, within the slanting marble roof; but it would have been easy to arrange the panels of this ceiling so that the light should penetrate through some of them into the rooms below.

It is to be remembered that a visitor to the Acropolis would see the Parthenon first from its north-western corner; he would then have to pass right along its northern side before reaching its front, and so entering the cella by the great eastern door. We shall see later how these conditions affected the choice and the placing of the sculptural decoration, but they doubtless weighed also with the architect in fixing the proportions of the temple, which are certainly most impressive as seen from the Propylæa by a spectator who faces the north-western angle of the temple and stands at some distance below it.

The Parthenon represented the perfection of Doric architecture; it had neither the stiffness and formality that are sometimes associated with the order—mainly through the influence of Roman or modern imitations—nor the massive but somewhat clumsy proportions of the

¹ ὁς πρῶτιστος τεύξε λίθου κέραμον.

earlier Doric buildings in Greece. The exquisite combination of strength, simplicity, and grace which distinguishes it beyond all other buildings preserved to us from antiquity, may be appreciated to some extent even at first sight of the temple in its present state, but all the refinement and subtlety of design and execution that have contributed to produce this result can only be realised by a minute study of its forms and proportions. This study was first made by Mr. F. C. Penrose, F.R.S., and his exact measurements and calculations, published in 1851, came as a revelation to architects. For a full and detailed account, his great work on the *Principles of Athenian Architecture* must be consulted, but a summary will suffice to show the nature of his discoveries.

In the first place, there is hardly a straight line of any length in the whole building. The steps upon which it rests have a convex curve; though the total rise does not amount to more than four inches at the highest point, in the middle of each side, and to three inches at the middle of the front and back, it is easily perceptible to the eye, if seen from the corner of the building, and doubtless produces an unconscious effect at a greater distance or from a different point of view. The architrave above the columns has a similar curve, though it is not now so regular, owing probably to the accidents that have shattered the building. The curve may also be recognised in the substructure on which the Parthenon stands, which was, as we have seen, prepared for an

earlier building; it is, indeed, a usual feature in any well-constructed Greek temple. The nicety with which this curve had to be calculated by the architect, and the allowances that had to be made for it, may best be realised by an examination of the corner columns. These were standing upon a bed that sloped both ways, and the necessary corrections are effected in their lowest drums,



NORTH SIDE OF PARTHENON, SHOWING CURVE OF STEPS.

of which the upper surfaces are nearly horizontal. As a result, these drums, instead of having their upper and lower surfaces parallel, are nearly two inches thicker on the outer side than on the inner; and there is a similar variation in thickness in the lowest drums of the other columns; the difference diminishes as we approach the middle of the front, back, or sides of the temple. This

correction is mainly due to the curve of the steps — or, to speak more exactly, of the top step or stylobate; but a small fraction of it is due to another cause. The axes of the columns themselves are not exactly vertical, but incline slightly inward, nearly three inches in their total height of over thirty-four feet. In this inclination, as well as in the curve of the stylobate, we may probably see examples of the application of two different principles. The first of these is optical correction; the second is the preference of a curve to a straight line. It is a matter of observation, which any one can test for himself, that a long horizontal straight line, with a number of vertical lines resting upon it, appears to the eye to sink slightly in the middle, and to rise toward the ends; still more is this the case with a horizontal line surmounted by a very shallow triangle, such as the gable of a Greek temple. And, moreover, the inward slope of the columns, and the slightly pyramidal shape which it gives to the whole temple, gives an appearance of stability which would be absent if all the columns were perfectly vertical. At the same time, though these optical corrections may supply the immediate cause for the curves which we may see in the main lines of the Parthenon, the architect was also aware of the fact that a curve is more pleasing to the eye than a straight line, and Mr. Penrose's accurate calculations have proved that the curves actually used are all of the most regular character, most of them being either hyperbolic or parabolic. It does not, however, necessarily follow that they were all laid out by mathe-

mathematical calculation, although of course such adjustments as we have noticed in the bottom drums of the columns must have been calculated to a nicety. The mathematical corrections of the curves may in some cases be due to an instinct for perfection of form and to training of eye and hand rather than to any conscious application of mathematical knowledge. The columns themselves show the same qualities in design and execution that characterise the whole temple. The entasis, or gentle swelling of the shaft, is in a single harmonious curve from capital to base; and the outline of the echinus, which in earlier Doric columns is in the form of a rounded bowl, here approaches so nearly to a straight line that at first sight its curve may easily be overlooked; but it is there, and its presence gives the appearance of elasticity which we miss in later examples of the order. Now that many of the columns are fallen, it is possible to see the means by which the extraordinary perfection of their workmanship was attained. The drums were roughly shaped at the quarry, but made a little larger than they were intended to be; and projecting blocks were left on them for the application of levers and ropes. Their external surfaces remained in this state until after they were erected, but the joint surfaces were elaborately prepared. The principle involved in this preparation is the same that we find applied also to the squared blocks of a wall, and to which Greek masonry of the best period owes the fineness of its joints. To say that a knife-blade could not be inserted between the blocks is a

very rough and inadequate way of expressing the fact; the joint shows often so fine a line as scarcely to be perceptible to the eye. It would have been practically impossible to make the two surfaces fit so exactly as this all over, and therefore the joint surface in every case



UNFINISHED DRUMS OF COLUMNS.

The upper one shows the flutes begun at the bottom. The one on the left shows rough surface and projections for use of levers.

is made only a few inches broad, all round the edges of the drum or block; and the rest of the surface is slightly sunk.

On the surfaces of the fallen drums we can see several different varieties of work. First of all, for a few inches all round the edge, there is a perfectly smooth surface, which formed the actual joint. Within this, the greater part of the drum is covered with fine marks of a tooth chisel, which remain quite fresh; and near the middle there is a shallow circular depression,

showing rough punch marks. The centre of this is occupied by a square hole; and the joint has actually proved so perfectly air tight that in some cases the wooden plug that fitted into this hole has been preserved; some examples can be seen in the Acropolis Museum at Athens. This wooden plug was cut off flush with the surface of the drum, and in its middle was a round hole, into which a cylindrical peg was inserted, projecting so as to fit also the corresponding hole in the adjoining drum. This peg was not of course adequate, either in size or material, to resist any great strain, and so it cannot have been intended as a tenon to hold the drums in place; their weight alone, on a horizontal surface, would suffice for this, and nothing but the terrible shock of an explosion or of an earthquake could have displaced them as they are now displaced. The peg must therefore have served the purpose of exact adjustment when they were set in position; perhaps at the same time they were turned round and ground against one another, to remove any slight unevenness in the joint surface; but it is difficult to see how this could have been done without throwing on the wooden peg a heavier strain than it could bear. The deeper depression with a roughly dressed surface would serve to receive any superfluous marble dust that was rubbed off in the process of finally adjusting the drums. The top block of each column included the top of the shaft as well as the echinus and the square abacus. From the point of view of historical

evolution, it may perhaps seem a solecism to make these three members out of a single block; they must of course represent different portions of the original wooden structure. But the practice is common in Doric temples, and is doubtless due to the difficulty of exact adjustment and the risk of shifting if they were made of separate pieces. The top of the flutings was worked on this block before it was set up; and their lower ends were worked on the lower portion of the bottom drum also before it was placed in position. The



JOINT OF FALLEN DRUM, SHOWING VARIOUS WORKING OF SURFACE.

rest of the drums were left rough on the outside until after the column was erected; and in many unfinished temples one may still see the tops and bottoms of the flutings alone indicated—for example, at Segesta in Sicily and at Rhamnus and Eleusis in Attica. On the Acropolis itself, in front of the modern museum may be seen some bottom drums, prepared but never used, with the flutings worked on their lower portion only. After the columns were erected it was easy to stretch a line from the top to the bottom of each flute,

and so to carry them with perfect precision through the joints. By this method also there was no risk of chipping the fine edges of the marble by setting one drum on another after the final surface was completed. The only exception was in the case of the top joint, since the fluting above it was previously completed; here we find the edge of the flutings bevelled away, and the real joint only beginning a little distance from the edge. The result is a distinct dark line round the finished column, which may always be seen, even when the other joints are so perfect as to escape observation. This technique implies that it is impossible to place the drums of a column in position after they have been fluted, or to replace them when once they have fallen. The unfortunate attempt that has been made to rebuild some of the fallen columns of the Parthenon offers a warning against any further proceeding of the same sort. They have none of the life and elasticity that distinguish the unfallen columns; and this is mainly due to the fact that their joints are no longer perfect, nor their flutings continuous.

This description of the columns and of the manner in which they were made will suffice to exemplify the precision of design and mechanical skill in execution that characterise the Parthenon throughout; nothing, however, but a careful study of the forms will suffice to show the extraordinary degree of perfection in working marble that they imply. It is impossible to detect any deviation from the mathematical exactness of the

curved surfaces, yet this result was probably achieved entirely by hand, with the aid of the simplest mechanical contrivances, such as templets, measures, or lines. To the student of Gothic architecture such uniformity may seem likely to produce a monotonous or lifeless result; but no one who has seen the Parthenon can feel this to be the case. The same loving care in detail that elsewhere produces infinite variety is here subordinated to the systematic perfection of the whole; but its presence is none the less perceptible in the subtle and appropriate curve of every outline and moulding. The design of these must of course be attributed to the architect Ictinus; but his ideas could never have been carried out without the help of a body of masons whose technical ability and scrupulous exactness were worthy of such a master.

The architrave above the outer columns was made in three pieces set side by side, because of its great size; but the effect, except when seen from directly below, was the same as if there had been a single block stretching from column to column. Above the architrave, on the outside, there were set the blocks of the triglyphs, each with a groove on either side, into which the comparatively thin slabs of the metopes, with their carving in high relief, were dropped from above; over the inner block of the architrave was a row of plain slabs, decorated at the top with a curved moulding or cymatium which has in many places preserved the traces of a painted pattern; on these inner slabs rested

the beams that carried the marble casket roof of the peristyle. Between the inner slabs and the triglyphs there was a narrow open space, broader at the metopes. The whole was covered by the thinner horizontal slabs



SECTION OF PART OF PARTHENON, RESTORED.

which projected externally to form the cornice. The roof was borne by wooden beams and rafters, on which rested the Parian marble slabs or tiles which we have already noticed as intended, by their transparency, to assist in the lighting of the interior. The six inner columns at front and back were somewhat smaller than

those of the peristyle, and stood on a pavement two steps higher; the entablature that rested upon them was similar in construction to that over the external columns, except that in the place of the metopes and triglyphs were set the slabs of the continuous frieze in low relief, which also is continued at the same height all round the temple, crowning the side walls of the cella. Above the cornice at each end of the temple the gable rose in a solid wall, faced with thinner marble slabs, to form a background to the pedimental sculptures; and above the triangular space was a second cornice, completing the massive frame in which these sculptures were set.

The sculpture of the Parthenon¹ was, as we have seen, applied to the decoration of three portions of the building, — the metopes between the triglyphs of the outer Doric frieze, the triangular fields of the two gables or pediments, and the continuous frieze within the peristyle, above the inner columns and the walls of the cella. Each of these series of sculptures was made to suit different conditions of architectural surroundings, and also, to some extent, under different artistic influences. Chronologically, the three must be placed in the order named, as is shown by their style; on technical architectural grounds we might come to the same conclusion, since the metopes had to be slipped into the grooves of the triglyph blocks before the cornice was laid above them, and consequently before the pedimental figures

¹ For the Parthenon sculpture generally, see Waldstein, *Essays on the Art of Pheidias*.

could be set in position; and the frieze on the wall of the cella would not probably be added until after the completion of the peristyle and all that belonged to it. But these architectural arguments are inconclusive; for it is always a matter of doubt how far the sculpture was completed in the studio, and whether the work, or a good deal of it, may not have been done after the blocks were *in situ*.

The metopes are in high relief, to suit the massive architectural frame in which they are set. The Parthenon is the only extant temple in which all the metopes are sculptured, and their great number—ninety-two in all—offered great scope for variety in subject and treatment. With the exception of those from the south side of the temple, the metopes have suffered much from exposure to the weather and from other vicissitudes, and it is by no means easy in many cases even to make out their subject. It seems, however, that the metopes on the western front represented the battle of the Greeks and the Amazons, and those on the eastern front the battles of the Gods and the Giants. The division of subjects between the north and south sides was not so simple. At either end of the south side were twelve metopes with scenes from the combat of the Lapiths and the Centaurs; but the eight metopes in the middle had different subjects, several of them showing female figures in various attitudes. Similarly on the north side toward either end the metopes that are left or of which drawings are preserved have vari-

ous scenes, most of them including female figures, and have been conjectured with some probability to refer to the sack of Troy; but the metopes in the middle appear¹ to have contained further scenes from the centaumachy. By their choice of all these subjects there is little doubt that the Athenians intended to depict, to the glory of their goddess, the mythical prototypes of their own victories over the Persians, which were still fresh in their memory; and such a theme was appropriate to the Parthenon, built as it was from the funds subscribed by the Greeks against the common foe, but no longer necessary since the maritime empire of Athens guaranteed the protection these funds were intended to provide. In the distribution of the subjects on the different sides of the temple there is evidence of a distinct artistic intention, which is in all probability to be attributed to the architect rather than to the sculptor or sculptors employed. The vigorous, often violent scenes of the centaumachy show the greatest originality of composition; and by their splendid combination and contrast of the human and equine forms, by the striking pose and strong relief of their various groups, they arrest the attention of the beholder, whether far or near. For this reason they are not placed on the fronts below the pediments, where they would have diverted the eye from the more important groups

¹ The evidence for this is rather doubtful; the metopes themselves have entirely disappeared; but centaurs are shown on drawings by D'Ottiers' artist, which are generally supposed to belong to the north side.

above them, nor even near the ends of the north side; for, as we have seen, a visitor first saw the Parthenon from the north-west, and then passed along to the north-east corner, and consequently his view of either front would usually include the nearer part of the north side. We find accordingly that the scenes on the metopes at either end of the north side are quieter and less striking; only in the middle of this side, in all probability, were some centaur metopes to give it variety. With the south side it is different. This is the side of the Parthenon that is most conspicuous from below; it is, indeed, the only aspect of the building that can be clearly seen without mounting the Acropolis, since there is only a comparatively narrow space between the temple and the south wall of the Acropolis. This space, moreover, can only be approached after passing the east or west front, and, if we may judge from the case of Pausanias, was not necessarily included in a walk round the Acropolis. It follows that the south side of the Parthenon was intended chiefly to be seen by itself as a whole, and to be seen from a distance; and these two facts had a paramount influence on the distribution of the metopes. Scenes from the centauro-machy were placed on the south side, twelve at each end, separated by a set of quieter and more miscellaneous subjects in the middle. In this way the bold and vigorous design and execution of the centaur metopes gained their full effect in contrast with the massive architectural frame in which they were set; and this contrast



SOUTH-WEST CORNER OF PARTHENON, SHOWING METOPE S. I., IN SITU.
Centaur and Lapith.

would be strongest at the ends, where the structural features of the building are most conspicuous, but at the same time they would not obtrude themselves on the notice of the spectator, to the detriment of the general harmony and balance of the sculptural decoration of the temple.

These centaur groups from the south side are the only metopes that have escaped, partially or entirely, from the effects of weather and of the various vicissitudes of the Parthenon. It is therefore fortunate that, so far as we can judge from the scanty traces of sculpture on the rest of the metopes, they were also the finest originally both in composition and execution; but they also vary greatly among themselves in both qualities.

There are in the first place certain metopes which, though full of vigour, show no trace of exaggeration or display. For balance and restraint in composition, and for mastery in execution, they can find a parallel only in the pediments of the Parthenon; and their



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

METOPÉ S. XXVIII.

Centaur and Lapith.

style, both in the treatment of the nude and of drapery, also resembles that of the pediments. Among these metopes perhaps the most conspicuous is the spirited figure of a centaur exulting in triumph over a prostrate foe. Here every line and every detail of the modelling

is full of expression, yet there is a certain restraint and rhythm about the composition which adapts it to the space within which it is confined, and prevents any feeling of inconsistency between the violent motion of the centaur and the rigid architectural frame of the metope. There is, moreover, a fine contrast between



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

METOPÉ S. XXVII.

Centaur and Lapith.

the exuberant life of the centaur and the lifeless body of the Lapith, relaxed, yet full of grace even in death. This group is also remarkable for the way in which it exactly fills the available space,—a quality which it shares with the metopes that rival it in other artistic merits. In another of these finest metopes we see the

balance of combat used with the highest artistic skill, so as to adapt the group to its architectural setting. Here the Lapith has seized the centaur by the hair, and throws the whole weight of his body backward across the metope, to check the onward rush of his adversary, and the crossing, both of lines and of impetus, that is thus produced, makes the group both complete in itself and admirably suited to its square frame. Here we can see also perhaps the earliest example of a decorative use of drapery that was to have very extensive influence at a somewhat later date. The chlamys of the Lapith has only its extreme corners thrown over his right shoulder and his left arm, so that the rest of it hangs, in richly curving folds, to form a background to his body. The effect of contrast is admirable; but it must be admitted that the chlamys is placed in a position where it could hardly remain for a moment, even if the figure were at rest,—much less in the midst of a combat. The drapery is used, in fact, not to express more fully and vividly the sculptor's conception of the scene he represents, but with the direct intention of gaining a certain artistic effect,—a dangerous tendency of which we may see the consequences elsewhere. There are other metopes, hardly if at all inferior to these, with great variety in the treatment of the scenes of combat. In one of them centaur and Lapith advance from opposite sides; the Lapith seizes by the throat the centaur, who rears up to meet him; in another, the Lapith has forced the centaur down on his knees by

pressing his knee against his back, while he throttles him with his left arm and hand.

Many of the metopes are less advanced in their technique, and vary a good deal in quality. Some of them, though full of vigour and originality, show a certain hardness of modelling, and an exaggeration of athletic pose in the composition, which are characteristic of the transition from archaic stiffness to complete freedom.

It was natural that at such a time the new knowledge of anatomy should lead to undue display of the muscular structure of the human form, and that, when the conventional types of early art were



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

METOPÉ S. VII.

Centaur and Lapith.

for the first time discarded, the artist should not always make the most discreet use of a practically unlimited choice of motives. Sometimes, as in the case of the finest of the Parthenon metopes, the instinct for sculptural appropriateness supplied the guidance and the restraint that are usually due to convention or artistic tradition; but in some other metopes, as in those of the Theseum, positions of unstable equilibrium are by

no means avoided, and even tricks of the wrestling school are imported into heroic contests in such a way as to impair their dignity even while increasing their realism. Sometimes the result is even more unsatisfac-



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

METOPÉ S. XXX.
Centaur and Lapith.

tory, and the composition, in its aim at originality, becomes either weak and unconvincing, or even ungainly and displeasing in effect. Examples of what we may call athletic exaggeration occur in metopes 8 and 9 of the south side; while

the weaker and more unsatisfactory work may be seen in metopes 30 and 31. In metope 31 particularly, the raised right leg and bent left arm of the Lapith suggest that he is not exerting the force, so much insisted on in the hard and dry muscles of his torso, to any good purpose; and the position of the centaur is hardly stronger, though we see the same exaggeration in his torso and in the expression of his face. The metopes containing female figures are also, for the most part, of the most inefficient class—a fact that in itself is significant as to the school to which the metopes are

due — although, curiously enough, the drapery in one of them (29) is executed with a skill that contrasts with the awkward pose of the figure and resembles the technique of the pediments.

It is evident, from what has been said, that the metopes do not show either the unity or the uniformity which we should expect if they were, even in design, the work of a single man. The differences between them are more marked, and affect the whole composition of the groups in a greater degree than would have been possible if a common design had been executed by various hands. After a mere distribution of the subjects on the building, which, as we have seen, is mainly governed by architectural principles, the artists who undertook the individual metopes seem



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

METOPÉ S. XXXI.

Centaur and Lapith.

to have been given a free hand. These artists seem, for the most part, to have belonged to a school which gave most of its attention to athletic subjects; all of them delight in rendering the details of the male torso

and limbs, some with the exaggeration of leanness of anatomy, some with the moderation that comes of mastery; none of them treats the female figure with any success, and, with two or three notable exceptions, the drapery leaves much to be desired. It would be tempting to go further, and to assign the metopes, in classes, to the hands of different individual sculptors, on the lines of division already indicated. But any such attempt must involve a great deal of conjecture, especially now that the majority of the metopes of the Parthenon are either lost or so much defaced that it is impossible to judge of their style. It is more instructive to notice that in the athletic tendencies of the sculptors who made the metopes, their vigour and originality of composition, their choice of subjects, and even in what they avoid or treat in a perfunctory manner, we can trace a clear analogy to what we know of Myron, the greatest of Attic sculptors of this athletic class. Not that we should therefore assume any direct connection between Myron and the Parthenon metopes; but his influence must have been great among his contemporaries and successors; and in the metopes of the Parthenon and the Theseum we may recognise the traces of this influence, though the sculptures themselves, both in design and execution, show a freshness and originality which preclude the possibility of any common controlling and directing power. In this respect they offer a contrast to the rest of the sculptures of the Parthenon, the pediments and the frieze.

If the pediments of the Parthenon were known to us only from what is left of them either in the British Museum or on the building itself, we should have little notion of their subject or composition, though we could still appreciate the supreme excellence of their execution and the beauty of the individual figures. Fortunately, however, the extant sculptures are supplemented by other evidence which enables us to obtain at least a general notion of their appearance when complete, though many details must always remain unknown. We have, in the first place, Carrey's drawings, which show us the west pediment almost complete, though he saw even less than we can still see of the east pediment. His drawings are supplemented by some others, which serve to confirm or correct them in details. The information given us by Pausanias is very meagre; instead of mentioning, as he does at Olympia, the individual figures, and so giving us a clue even where he himself made mistakes in their identification, he contents himself with saying that, "in the case of the Parthenon, all the group in the front pediment refers to the birth of Athena, and that at the back contains the contest of Posidon against Athena for the land." These subjects, however, are represented on some vases or reliefs that have survived from ancient times;¹ some of these are directly derived from the pediments of the

¹ One set of miniature copies of figures from the Parthenon pediments found at Eleusis might have proved most valuable; but unfortunately they give us little information which we cannot obtain elsewhere. See 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1890. 12, 13.

Parthenon, and others, especially those of earlier date, show the way in which the theme usually presented



CARREY'S SKETCH OF WEST PEDIMENT.


itself to the Greek artist. Another source of evidence that has only recently, owing to the careful study of Professor Sauer, come to be appreciated at its full value is to be found in the extant floor and background of the pediments themselves. Here may still be seen clear traces of the pedimental figures, — sockets prepared to receive their bases or the attributes that belonged to them, places where the ground has been protected from the weather by a superimposed figure, discoloration from metal or other adjuncts, and the indications of great metal bars to take the weight of heavier masses off the ground of the pediment. With the help of this evidence, Professor Sauer has been able not only to ascertain the exact position of figures either still

extant or recorded by Carrey, but to infer, with a high degree of probability, the character and position of

figures now entirely lost. Such indications cannot, of course, suffice for the restoration of a lost group where there is no other material to supplement them; but where such material exists, the marks on the pediment are a great help in choosing between alternative possibilities and in fitting the various figures together in their probable relation.

The back or western¹ pediment is the better known to us in its general composition, though the finest individual figures preserved are nearly all from the east pediment; it will therefore be most convenient to consider the subject and the probable restoration of the west pediment first.

The subject, as we are told by Pausanias, was the contest between Athena and Posidon for the land; this, as we learn from other recorded versions of the legend, must mean for the land of Attica. Each of the rival deities is said to have produced a symbol



CARREY'S SKETCH OF EAST PEDIMENT.

¹ It will be remembered that some travellers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries confused the front and back pediments, because the church was entered from what was the back of the Parthenon as a temple.

or token of possession, — Athena her olive tree, and Posidon a salt spring; both these symbols were shown in the precincts of the Erechtheum throughout classical times. For the moment in this contest chosen by the artist, and the manner in which he represented it, we are dependent in the first place upon Carrey's sketch, for the extant fragments do not suffice to show us the arrangement of the central group. In addition to these, we may compare the treatment of the same subject on a vase found at Kertch and now in St. Petersburg; and the group of Athena and Posidon occurs also, with some variations of pose, on certain Athenian coins and a relief. We must remember that the subject appeared again in a group set up on the Acropolis near the Parthenon, which, as we have noticed, was not improbably an alternative design for the pediment. The Kertch vase shows the most extensive composition and is the most clearly related to the Parthenon — some even recognise in the little temple represented on the vase a kind of symbolic acknowledgment on the part of the painter of the source from which his representation is derived; but when we compare it carefully with Carrey's drawing, we must admit that it is impossible to see the same motives in the principal figures of the two compositions. Athena indeed advances in both cases away from the centre; on the vase her right arm is raised with the point of the spear directed downward, as if just before, or more probably just after, a blow that has struck the ground. But Posidon, who

on the vase is advancing in the same direction as Athena, and holding his trident with point downward, just as she is holding her spear, is represented in a totally different attitude in Carrey's drawing; on the pediment he was not advancing but drawing back from the centre. Again, on the vase the motive of the chief group is complicated by the addition of a third person, Dionysus, who approaches rapidly from behind Athena with thyrsus advanced, as if to join in the contest. Apart from the variation in subordinate figures, these differences between vase and pediment in the central group suffice to show that the moment and even the subject of the representation are not identical in the two cases. The vase seems to follow a different version of the myth, which introduces Dionysus as one of the principal actors; and although its interpretation has been much disputed, there seem only two possible explanations of the action of the chief figures: either they are represented in the very act of producing their respective symbols, — perhaps at the moment after the blow of spear and trident that have produced olive and salt spring,¹ — or else, as some suggest,² Posidon is represented as attacking with his trident the olive of Athena, while the goddess, supported by Dionysus and her sacred snake, hastens to its protection. Neither of these motives can possibly be reconciled with the action of the figures on the pediment, as recorded by Carrey's sketches: and it cannot be maintained that these

¹ Petersen, *Arch. Z.*, 1875, p. 115.

² Robert, *Hermes*, 1881, p. 60.

sketches, which are supported by other evidence, are incorrect in their record of the whole composition. It has been necessary to devote so much attention to the vase, because some writers¹ were inclined to overrate its importance, especially when it was first discovered, and even to follow it, rather than Carrey's sketch, in their attempts to recover the composition of the pediment. While avoiding so extreme a view, we need not refuse to admit that the vase is derived from the pediment, though it treats the subject in an independent manner; it probably resembles the pediment in having the olive tree in the centre of the group and in the treatment of Athena. The salt spring, represented by two dolphins, corresponds closely to the indications in Carrey's and other sketches. Here, however, the resemblance ends; and the subordinate figures on the vase are chosen freely by the artist to fill the sides of his field; nor can we trace any direct connection between them and the pedimental figures.

The subject, as treated on coins, varies considerably; but the usual type shows Athena and Posidon as if in friendly converse, with the olive tree between them; it is a probable conjecture that this type reproduces the group set up to the north of the Parthenon and already more than once referred to. In any case it has no close relation to the pediment, any more than a relief published by Robert,² in which the two rival

¹ Especially Stephani, who first published the vase, *Compte Rendu*, 1872-3.

² *Hermes*, 1881, p. 60.

deities await the arbitrament of their quarrel on either side of a table, on to which Nike is emptying the votes from an urn. On some coins, however, we have a figure of Athena and her olive tree which corresponds very closely to the figure on the pediment, and which may help us in its restoration.

Let us now see what may be inferred from Carrey's drawings, from the extant remains, and from other evidence, as to the subject and composition of the west pediment.

In the centre was the olive tree, for which the socket can still be seen in the floor of the pediment; to the left of it was Athena, advancing impetuously from behind it; and, as she advances, she turns half round to face her rival. Posidon, on the right of the olive, was not advancing but starting back, as if some sudden and unexpected object had sprung up in his path; this object can hardly be anything but the olive tree itself, the symbol of his opponent's victory and his own defeat. The result of the contest is thus clearly enough indicated by the attitude of the two chief figures—the confident and triumphant gesture of the goddess, who perhaps grasped a branch of the tree with her left hand,¹ and the hasty retreat of Posidon, who practically acknowledges his defeat, speak for themselves; there is no need of messengers to declare the decision, nor of jurors to arbitrate. Behind each is a chariot, which serves, as at Olympia,

¹ B. M. Catalogue, 339. 13.

to frame the central group, and to facilitate the transition from its colossal size to the smaller scale of the subordinate figures. The chariot of Athena is driven by her constant attendant, Nike, who here serves also to typify her victory; the chariot of Posidon has also a female charioteer, probably his consort, Amphitrite. Beside the horses on either side is another figure. These two have been interpreted as Hermes and Iris, the messengers and heralds of the gods, who may appropriately be present to marshal the rival claimants for the land; their position and action is inconsistent with the suggestion that they are sent to carry a message from Zeus to the two competing deities.

Behind the charioteers on either side, the rest of the pedimental field is filled with a number of subordinate figures which have given rise to a very great variety of interpretations. A bare enumeration of these would require a considerable space, but, if we exclude mere random guesses, we may distinguish two main principles of interpretation, one or other of which is predominant in the more probable theories. Either these figures represent a series of minor divinities or of heroes, or else they are to be regarded as a series of local personifications serving to indicate the place where the event took place. The two principles are not indeed mutually exclusive; it is possible for a deity or a hero to represent his chosen haunt or the place that is most closely associated with his worship; but such cases are the exception rather than

the rule. The first theory has found a recent advocate in Professor Furtwängler,¹ who identifies every figure, with much ingenuity, but upon rather inadequate data. He sees on the left side Cecrops and his family as the partisans of Athena, on the right Erechtheus, with his daughter and grandsons, as the adherents of Posidon; he even goes so far as to identify the recumbent figures at the ends, and those next them, as the heroes, Buzyges and Butes, and their wives. This view may be contrasted with the theory of Brunn, who practically reduces the subordinate figures to a sort of animated map of the coast from the Eleusinian Cephissus to Sunium. A more probable application of the same method of interpretation may be seen in the identification of the recumbent figure at the left, or north end, as the river Cephissus,² of which the bed, marked by olive belts, can actually be seen to the north of the Acropolis, and the two end figures at the right end as Ilissus and Callirrhoe, also visible to the south; in this way we have a close analogy to the eastern pediment of the temple at Olympia, where the recumbent figures at the ends, according to the identification given by Pausanias, represent the river gods Alpheus and Cladeus;³ and, while

¹ *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*, Appendix.

² The old conventional name of this figure is the Ilissus, chosen as that of the most famous river of Athens; this identification is, however, improbable on topographical grounds.

³ It is true that this identification has been disputed, but not, I think, on any sufficient grounds.

these define the scene of the action that is portrayed, they are also placed in such a position as to correspond, when seen on the temple, to the actual and visible topography of the region. The style of the Cephisus, with its flowing, water-like texture, as we shall see, strongly confirms this identification; and if it be accepted, symmetry and composition alike require that the female figure kneeling beside him should



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

CECROPS AND DAUGHTER.

From West Pediment.

be associated with him, as a spring or tributary. The only one among the other figures that offers any clear evidence to assist its identification is that of a seated man, with a girlish figure

kneeling beside him and putting her arm round his neck. This figure, which is still *in situ* on the pediment, is seated on a great coil of a snake, and can hardly be any one but Cecrops; the snake is an allusion to his earth-born origin; in cruder representations he has a snake-like tail instead of legs. As Cecrops is said to have been present at the contest between Athena and Posidon, — as arbiter, according to some accounts, — and as he also appears as a seated and kingly figure on the Kertch vase, there is everything in favour of

his identification in the pediment. It follows naturally that the three female figures that appear beside him in Carrey's drawing are his three daughters, Aglauros, Herse, and Pandrosos. These maidens, in Attic legend, are best known in connection with the child Erichthonius, who was intrusted to their custody by Athena. It is therefore natural to identify the child who appears between two of them as Erichthonius. It is, indeed, difficult to reconcile such an identification with the recorded version of the story, according to which the boy was given to them concealed in a chest which they were forbidden to open, and, when the maidens, or two of them, violated this command, they were struck with madness and threw themselves from the Acropolis. But it is probable, as Miss Harrison suggests, that this tale merely grew up to explain an obscure ritual; it does not seem consistent with the fact that Aglauros was the special patroness of the Athenian youths, who took their oath in her precinct, and that Herse and Pandrosos were associated with her as fostering divinities.

The figures on the right side, behind the chariot of Posidon, are even more difficult to identify, partly because what is left of them is extremely fragmentary, and Carrey's drawing is of a summary character. They consist of a seated female figure with two children, a reclining female figure with a nude figure — whether male or female is very much disputed — seated on her knees, and another seated female

figure.¹ These are most commonly regarded as marine divinities associated with Posidon; the tempestuous treatment of the drapery of the only one of them of which a considerable portion survives certainly adds to the probability of this theory, but certainty on this matter hardly seems to be attainable.

Before considering the character of the pedimental sculptures, both in composition and in execution, it will be best to discuss also the probable restoration and interpretation of the east pediment. Here we have a more difficult task before us—one which at first sight may well seem hopeless, since Carrey's drawings fail us, except so far as concerns the few figures still extant from either end of the pediment. Fortunately, however, we possess in this case a relief, evidently derived from the eastern pediment of the Parthenon, and probably reproducing it more faithfully than any monument that can be quoted from the western pediment. With the help of this relief, and of Professor Sauer's study of the indications on the building, it is perhaps possible to restore, with at least some degree of probability, the main composition.

The subject of the pediment, as we learn from Pausanias, was the birth of Athena. We have, in Pindar and in the Homeric hymn to Athena, descriptions of this event which show us a poetical conception worthy to be set beside the sculpture of the Parthenon:—

¹ Furtwängler places yet another figure, which he identifies as Erechtheus, between this and the kneeling man (river god). But there does not seem to be room. With this disappears his identification of the three female figures as the daughters of Erechtheus with their children.

“When by the craft of Hephæstus, by the blow of the bronze axe, Athena leaping forth from the crown of her father’s head shouted with an exceeding great cry, and the heaven shuddered at her and mother Earth.

“Whom Zeus the counsellor himself bore from his holy head, clad in her warlike arms, golden and glittering. Reverence came upon all the immortals as they saw her. And she in haste rushed forward in front of ægis-bearing Zeus from his immortal head, brandishing a sharp spear. And great Olympus was shaken terribly at the might of the gray-eyed goddess; and earth around resounded terribly; and the sea was moved, stirred in dark waves, and suddenly the foam was poured forth. And the bright son of Hyperion stayed his swift-footed horses for a long time, until the maiden Pallas Athena took from her immortal shoulders the divine armour; and Zeus the counsellor rejoiced.”

The Attic vases that reproduce this scene show Athena, like a miniature doll, clad in armour, emerging from the crown of her father’s head, as he sits enthroned among the gods; Hephæstus, the axe still in his hand, starts back from the result of his blow; Apollo with his lyre and Ilithyia stand near to Zeus. Though most of the figures in this composition, including that of Zeus himself, are appropriate enough, and indeed do not admit of much variation, it is improbable that Athena should have been represented in such a manner in the pediment of her temple. We should rather expect her




BIRTH OF ATHENA.
On puteal at Madrid.

to share with Zeus the position of honour in the centre of the group; "she rushed forward in front of Zeus," as the Homeric hymn has it. The relief from the cylindrical well-head (puteal) now at Madrid shows us the scene treated in this way, with Athena moving impetuously forward in front of Zeus, who sits enthroned; between the two, Nike floats to crown her. Behind Zeus stands Hephæstus with his axe, starting back; and beyond him are the three Fates, who, on the other side, bring the composition round again to Athena.¹ The whole composition is evidently derived from some well-known original, which can hardly be any other than this Parthenon pediment; the figure of Athena has a strong resemblance to the figure of Athena in the west pediment, and the figure of Hephæstus recalls the figure of Hephæstus still extant. It is hardly rash to infer that the Fates were also present on the pediment, in some form not unlike that we see on the Madrid puteal.

If now we examine the indications noted by Professor

¹ The relief, being on a cylinder, is of course continuous. It is usually broken, for convenience of reproduction, between Hephæstus and the Fates. But it must be remembered that this break is arbitrary, and does not exist in the puteal.

Sauer, we find that the central group consisted of a seated figure on a throne, evidently Zeus, and a standing figure in front of him to the right; this must have been Athena. Hephæstus, from his prominent share in the action, probably came next to one of these two; and the extant torso, with its inclination to the right, must be placed beyond Athena, if the action of starting back from the blow is to be retained. Behind Zeus is a space for another standing figure; here Apollo, with his lyre, may appropriately be placed, if we may judge from the vases; behind him are places prepared for one seated and two standing figures. The three Fates of the puteal at once suggest themselves as offering just what is required by the conditions; and thus we have the whole of the gap filled up on the left side. On the right side we must restore, behind Hephæstus, one seated and two standing figures, one of the two being Nike, if the extant torso be thought to belong to this pediment rather than to the western; beyond them was a figure, now lost, hurrying to the right, corresponding to the figure in rapid motion to the left, which is still extant just beyond the gap on the left side. These two figures are evidently the messengers who are bearing the news of the birth of Athena from Olympus to the world beyond; the one extant is usually identified as Iris, and she was probably matched by Hermes at the other side. These two, then, form a sort of limit within which is the assembly actually present at the divine event on Olympus. The identification of the rest of the subordinate figures



SKETCH RESTORATION OF EAST PEDIMENT.

Below are the indications on the bed of the pediment, after Professor Sauer.

near the angles of the pediment has been much disputed. The only thing certain is that the whole scene is bounded by the sun-god rising from the waves at the left end, driving his team of four horses, and that the moon-goddess is sinking, also with her four-horse car,¹ beneath the field of the pediment at the right end. Thus the scene is represented as taking place at sunrise, and instead of the local definition of scene which we found on the west pediment, we have a kind of cosmic setting which is appropriate to the more august theme.

As to the other figures, we again meet with the same alternative theories as in the case of the west pediment,—the one, which would recognise in them gods or heroes present at the scene, the other, which would regard them as local, or in this case perhaps rather cosmic, impersonations. The latter

¹ The theory that this was the Moon, or probably Night, riding on a horse was finally disposed of by Professor Sauer's discovery of the remains of the other horses extant on the pediment.

view seems in this case preferable. If they are gods, it would be difficult to explain why they are outside Olympus rather than within it. If heroes, — or, rather, heroines, for there is only one male figure among them, — it is not easy to explain their presence or the principle on which they are selected. Professor Furtwängler, for example, suggests the Attic hero Cephalus¹ for the reclining male figure, because of his association with the dawn; but that association is so intimately connected with the personality of Eos (Aurora) that it is difficult to recognise an allusion to it in a scene where the dawn is represented only by the rising sun-god. The view that the figures beyond the messengers at either end are impersonations of nature is thoroughly in accordance with the practice of Greek art during its best period. But in this case we evidently must not look for personifications so strictly local as may perhaps be recognised in the west pediment. There the boundaries were marked by two rivers actually existing near the Acropolis itself; here they extend from sunrise on the east to moonset on the west, and so include the whole visible world. The personifications that have been suggested with most probability are in accordance with this principle. Thus Brunn suggested that the reclining male figure, who faces the rising sun, represents Mount Olympus, lighted by the rays of the dawn; and Olympus, in this case, is not a mere geo-

¹ He is commonly called Theseus; I do not think any one now maintains this identification as probable or even possible; but it affords a convenient name.

graphical impersonation, but is to be thought of as the typical mountain, the home of the Olympian gods. In the two seated female figures who come next, Brunnich recognised the Hours, to whom, according to Homer, as they sat in their place at the gates of Heaven, "was intrusted the care of great Heaven and Olympus, to open and to close the solid cloud." Thus the mes-



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

"HORAE" AND IRIS, FROM EAST PEDIMENT.

senger, Iris, in hurrying past them, would be represented as passing from Olympus to the world beyond. In the corresponding space at the other end, next to the setting moon, are three female figures, one seated apart, the other two intimately associated, the one reclining in the other's lap. These three figures are often called the Fates; but we have seen that the Madriputeal seems to indicate that the position of the

Fates is nearer to the centre of the composition, where they find a more appropriate place. Brunn suggested that these figures represent the clouds that accompany the setting moon; the impersonation of clouds, familiar in Greek literature, is, of course, possible enough. If this line of interpretation be right, another suggestion is that of Dr. Waldstein, who would identify the two closely associated figures as the Sea in the lap of the Earth.¹ It is impossible to reach certainty on such a matter as this; but the general principle of interpretation may be accepted, while its application in detail may be left to individual taste. Keats may well have had these figures near the ends of the east pediment in his mind when he associated the sculptures of the Parthenon with

"a billowy main,
A sun, a shadow of a magnitude."

So far we have been concerned mainly with the probable restoration and interpretation of the pediments; we must now consider their artistic qualities both in composition and in execution, and in doing this we must naturally devote our attention mainly to such portions of the sculpture as are still extant. It is impossible from this point of view to make any distinction between the two pediments, at least in their present condition; if more prominence is given to the composition of the west

¹ The chief objection to this is that the sun is represented rising from the waves of the sea — as it would on Olympus — and that the moon would not be likely to set in the sea at the same time — nor at all at Olympus.

pediment and to the detailed execution of the eastern this is only the result of the accident that has, in the one case, given us Carrey's drawing, in the other, a few figures in more perfect preservation.

The strict symmetry which we find in earlier pedimental compositions, such as those of Ægina and Olympia, is observed also in the Parthenon, but with a certain admixture of variety. Thus the figures to the right and left of the centre, both in the east and west pediments, seem to have corresponded to one another in number and also, apparently, in action and position; even the two children whom we see beside the figure just behind the chariot of Posidon correspond with one rather older child in the left half of the same pediment. Yet in spite of this evident correspondence, the figures on either side break up into groups which vary the monotony; thus the four figures behind Athena's chariot fall naturally into two groups of two each, while the four figures that correspond to them on the right side consist of a group of two in the middle, between two isolated figures. And the extreme end figures of the west pediment are in one case a reclining male and a kneeling female figure, while at the other end the sexes are reversed. Again, in the east pediment we have noticed, next to the sun and moon, a group of three figures on each side, which are remarkably similar in pose, the one nearest the centre turning her head to look toward the centre, the one in the middle full-face, the outside reclining figure looking away from the centre; yet here again each group is

broken up, so that on the left the two seated figures are closely associated, and the reclining figure is isolated, while on the right the reclining figure and the seated figure next it are in intimate relation, and the other seated figure is separated from them. The gradual intensification of interest as the centre of the composition is approached harmonises with the manner in which the eye is carried on from figure to figure and from group to group; but here also there is variety; the climax of interest in the centre of the composition is approached, as has been well said, in a succession of undulations rather than in a continuous and even slope. To descend to more technical details, extraordinary skill is shown in meeting the difficulties inherent in pedimental composition, and proceeding from the elongated triangular shape of the field that has to be filled. The device of kneeling and standing figures here seems so appropriate that its necessity does not obtrude itself. The difference of size between the figures in the middle and those at the sides is so cleverly dealt with that it partly adds to the effect, partly escapes notice. The colossal stature of the principal figures in the west pediment seems to be demanded, not by the architectural conditions, but by the story itself:—

*καλὸν καὶ μεγάλῳ σὺν τεύχεσιν ὥς τε θεῶ περ,
ἀμφὶς ἀριζήλῳ· λαοὶ δ' ὑπ' ὀλίζονες ἦσαν.*¹

But it is softened by the device already employed at Olympia, of placing a chariot on each side of the central

¹ Hom. *Il.* XVIII. 518–519.

group; these chariots with their teams not only separate the larger figures from the smaller, but also serve as a sort of frame, to throw the figures between them into higher apparent relief, and make them stand out conspicuously. In the east pediment a more subtle device seems to have been employed. We have noticed the indications that there was, on either side of the central group, a seated figure, placed at an equal distance from the centre. It is probable that these figures were approximately on the same actual scale as those next to them toward the centre; while, at the same time, by a well-known convention of Greek relief, their heads were represented as about on a level with those of the standing figures next to them on the outside. Thus, by a combination of natural and conventional scale, they made the change almost imperceptible, while, at the same time, they added to the variety of the whole group.

For our knowledge of these and other characteristics of the composition we are to a great extent dependent upon inferences from more or less satisfactory evidence; when we come to consider the style of the sculptures themselves, we must go to the surviving originals, which, though forming but a small proportion of the whole pediments, have sufficed to give them a supreme position among works of sculpture. We must, however, remember that this, the unanimous verdict of modern critics and artists, finds no confirmation in the records of classical time. Pausanias passes over the Parthenon sculptures with less attention than he gives

to the comparatively crude and archaic pediments and metopes of Olympia, and there is no other direct reference to them in all extant ancient literature, though the statue of the goddess within the temple is often mentioned. Strange as this may seem to us, we need not infer that the ancient Greeks set no store by these sculptures. Classical writers very rarely make any direct references to works of art; the pride of the Athenians in their Acropolis and all it contained is well enough attested, and the pediments of the Parthenon, though not separately referred to, formed an essential part of the glory of their town. It is true that they are architectural sculptures, and so, from their mere size and number, could not all have been executed by the master responsible for the design; and, moreover, the execution varies to some extent even in the extant figures, and so betrays the work of different hands. Yet, even when compared with the finest specimens of ancient art that may be seen in our museums—and some at least of these may claim to be originals from the hand of an ancient sculptor—the Elgin marbles maintain their unrivalled excellence. Nothing could bear clearer testimony to the high standard of work attained by the sculptors who were employed under Pericles and Phidias to assist in the execution of their great designs.

The two male figures that are best preserved are the reclining male figure, commonly called "Theseus," perhaps to be identified as Olympus, from the east pedi-

ment, and the river-god Cephisus from the west pediment. The two show a contrast in character which is thoroughly in accordance with the identifications proposed. The one is massive, solid, and heroic in proportions, though free alike from the clumsiness which often mars figures of such a character in later



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

"THESEUS," FROM EAST PEDIMENT.

art, and from the athletic exaggeration that we noticed in the metopes; his muscles, though strongly developed, are nowhere unduly conspicuous; and his position is one of dignified repose. It is remarkable how little the general effect of this figure is impaired by the weathered condition of its surface; there are, indeed, indications that it was never even finished with the minute elaboration which we see in the drapery on the same pediment.

The splendid design and proportions were left to speak for themselves, and consequently they still can impress us almost as when the work was fresh. The river-god from the west pediment, on the other hand, is a marvel for the rendering of softness of texture in the flesh; every muscle seems relaxed, and the modelling is so flowing, as almost to suggest a fluid material, in contrast to the firmness of the muscles of the "Theseus." It seems a fair inference that this character of work was intentionally chosen by the artist as appropriate to a river-



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mausell & Sons.

"ILISSUS," FROM END OF WEST PEDIMENT.

god; and at the same time he gave a fuller meaning to the conventional reclining position which we see at Olympia, and which becomes common in later art. Here the body and limbs alike are relaxed, and seem as if they could hardly raise themselves from the ground.

The female draped figures are even more beautiful in the details of their execution; they also vary to some degree in excellence, and reach their climax in the three figures which come next to the moon-goddess at the right end of the east pediment. The drapery here is

true both to its own material and to the forms which it covers; it is not like the rather mannered Attic drapery of a slightly later date, which sometimes clings and shows the form of the body to an almost impossible degree, sometimes floats in masses and curves that are too extravagant in their independence. It may seem remarkable



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

THREE DRAPED FEMALE FIGURES, FROM NORTH END OF EAST PEDIMENT.

that the earliest example of complete freedom from archaism also gives us the highest perfection in the treatment of drapery; but the elaborate care which had been given by earlier Attic sculptors to the study of drapery was not wasted; though it often led to stiff and frigid conventions, it created a style in which the merely accidental was scrupulously avoided; and the same principle is to be observed in the Parthenon pediments. In the Olympian pediments, and even in the metopes of the Parthenon, which, as we have seen, are the products of a more athletic school, accidental folds and details are not avoided, though they sometimes contrast strangely with

the archaic stiffness of their surroundings. But in the drapery on these figures from the pediments nothing is accidental; in spite of the extraordinary richness and freedom of the general effect, every fold is in its exact place in a system that permeates the whole. The broader masses are designed in harmony with the figures and with one another; and the minuter folds into which they are subdivided are always in strict relation to these broader masses, so that, while giving them infinite variety, they never obscure their general form. The mastery in the rendering of surface which we find in the pediments is also an inheritance from the crude attempts of early Attic sculptors — especially in the contrast of the broader and smoother folds taken by a thicker and heavier material with the wavy or crinkled surface of a finer and lighter web.¹ It is true that there seems at first little resemblance between the mere convention which we often see in the earlier sculptures and the style of the pediments of the Parthenon; yet, without such influence behind them, it could hardly have been possible for the men who worked under Phidias to have surpassed, not only their predecessors, but also their successors, in technical ability, as well as in nobility of conception. In the female figures themselves we see the same grandeur of proportions as in the male figures — here even more remarkable in contrast to the types that are familiar

¹ Possibly the contrast is between woollen and linen fabrics, as generally used in Doric and Ionic fashions respectively.

in later Greek art. No heads have been preserved among the pedimental figures, with the exception of that of the "Theseus," which is so badly weathered as to show nothing beyond the general proportions,



DE LABORDE HEAD, PROBABLY FROM PARTHENON PEDIMENT.

and a few inconsiderable fragments; but a head which is better preserved, though much restored, most probably comes from one of the figures on the pediment; it may well have been brought to Venice, where it was found, by a secretary of Morosini. This head, known from owners

to whom it has belonged as the Weber head or the de Laborde head,¹ shows a style thoroughly in accordance with that of the pediments—the same nobility of form, and the same simplicity and breadth of modelling; the hair, too, with its broad mass subdivided into finer tresses, reminds us of the drapery of the pedimental figures. It is impossible to say with certainty to which of the figures this head may have belonged; it is sometimes assigned to Nike, who drives the chariot of Athena in the west pediment.

The portion of the Parthenon pediments which excited in the highest degree the admiration of earlier travellers, was the chariot team of Athena in the west pediment. Wheler says,² “The Horses are made with such great Art that the Sculptor seems to have outdone himself, by giving them a more than seeming Life: such a Vigour is express’d in each posture of their prauncing, and stamping, natural to generous Horses.” The fame of these horses led to their destruction; for when Morosini captured the Acropolis in 1687 he tried to carry them off as a trophy, and broke them to pieces in the attempt. We have, however, still remaining, the horses’ heads from the teams of the sun and the moon in the eastern pediment, and these suffice to justify a description such as that of Wheler. The contrast between the two is marked; the horses of the sun-god, as they rise from the sea, throw up their heads with nostrils dilated to

¹ It is still in the collection of the Marquise de Laborde at Paris.

² Page 361.

inhale the breath of the morning; at the other end of the pediment the horse of the moon-goddess — the only one of the team which is preserved — though tired as he approaches the end of his course, still shows his mettle; indeed, this horse is equal in mastery of handling to any piece of work in the Parthenon. An obvious comparison is with the beautifully sculptured horses of one of the chariots on the frieze;¹ it resembles them in the wonderfully sensitive treatment of the skin of the muzzle, which seems almost to quiver, and its contrast with the smooth surface of the cheek showing the bone beneath; but in the head from the pediment the



HORSE OF SELENE, FROM EAST PEDIMENT.


eye is more prominent — a variation partly due to difference of relief and of lighting, but partly also to a distinct conception of the type. These horses' heads, as well as the drapery of the female figures, show to how

great a degree some of the sculptors who executed the pediments of the Parthenon had mastered the rendering of texture in marble.

The frieze of the Parthenon represents a continuous procession, which can hardly be any other than that of the Panathenæa. The composition starts from the south-west corner, whence it proceeds along the

¹ See p. 339, below.

west and north sides on the one hand, and the south side on the other, to turn the corners of the east front; here the head of each division approaches a group of gods seated to await the arrival of the festal throng. The order of the procession can be realised at a glance with the help of the accompanying diagram. The west



frieze is still *in situ* on the Parthenon (p. 336); that of the other three sides is preserved, mostly in the British Museum; a certain number of slabs are in museums at Athens or elsewhere.

The west frieze shows the Athenian knights preparing for the procession. Some are already mounted, and advancing toward the north-west corner singly or in pairs; others are bridling their horses, giving the last touches to their own toilet with the assistance of youthful attendants, or standing beside their horses ready to mount. Thus there is the greatest variety in the position of both horses and men. The preparations seem to overlap the corners at each end; at the extreme west end of the north side is one man yet unmounted beside a rearing horse, and at the west

end of the south side are some horses still walking, as if not yet included in the advancing troop of cavalry. This troop takes up more than half the length of the two long sides of the temple. The horses in it are bounding impetuously forward, sometimes in irregular order, sometimes in regular lines, six or seven abreast;



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Maassell & Sons.

WEST FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.

Rearing Horse.

but the perfect seat of the riders, and the graceful ease with which they manage their horses, give dignity to the cavalcade, and regulate the impetuousness of its advance. In front of the riders come the chariots, each accompanied by an armed warrior (*ἀποβάτης*), who either accompanies the driver in the car or mounts and dismounts while it is in motion. The former is the case on the extant examples from the south side, the latter in those from the north, and hence some have inferred

that different subjects are represented; but in all probability we need see here nothing but a concession to the exigencies of artistic representation. The driver always occupies the right of the car—a fact which shows us that in ancient Greece, as in England now, it was customary to take the left side of the road when passing another vehicle. Consequently, where, as on the south frieze, the chariots are advancing to the right, the armed



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

KNIGHTS FROM NORTH FRIEZE.

warrior would be hidden behind the charioteer while mounting or dismounting, as may be realised by looking at the corresponding part of the north frieze.

In front of the chariots, on both north and south friezes, is a series of groups on foot. One of these consists of bearded men who converse as they advance;

these are perhaps the thallophori, or bearers of olive branches,¹ or they may represent those who have been chosen in the contest of euandria, of manly bearing and comeliness; one of them is placing a wreath on his head. In front of them march the musicians playing on the flute and the lyre, and before them, again, men carrying



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

NORTH FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.

Older men.

sacred vessels or sacrificial implements. All that is left of these on the south side is a fragment of a man bearing a flat trough; on the north side are several similar figures, as well as some water carriers, holding great hydriæ on their shoulders. The eastern portion of both

¹ The branches are not represented in sculpture, but may have been added in painting.



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

NORTH FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.
Men bearing vases.

sides is occupied by the procession of victims, — cows only, the Athenian offering, on the south side; cows and sheep, the offering of the Athenian colonies, on the north.

The east frieze begins at each end with a series of maidens bearing bowls, jugs, censers, and other of the lighter sacrificial implements — an honourable task that was the privilege of well-born Athenians; they approach from either side a group of men conversing, — five on the one hand and four on the other, — who may probably be identified as the nine archons, who have gone on in advance, and are awaiting the arrival of the procession.

The head of it is received at either side by marshals, and similar figures, distinguishable by their long cloaks, appear at intervals throughout the frieze to order and regulate the advance; at the same time they introduce variety into its uniform direction by the occasional presence of figures standing full-front or turned to face its



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

NORTH FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.

COWS.

progress. Between the two groups of archons are the twelve gods, seated on chairs to receive the hospitality of Athena and of her chosen city. They are divided into two groups, with a gap between them containing figures to which we must return later. Each group turns its back upon this central scene, and looks toward the approaching procession. There has been much controversy about

the identification of these gods; but although there is still some room for difference of opinion, it can now be confined within very narrow limits. If we omit smaller accessory figures, there are seven gods and five goddesses present; in the usual orthodox pantheon of later days the sexes were equally divided, Dionysus being often



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

NORTH FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.

Sheep.

omitted. Reckoning him as present, there is no difficulty in identifying the seven gods and four out of the five goddesses — for it is evident that we must, in such an assembly, recognise all the enthroned figures as deities of Olympian rank, not mere attendants, impersonations, or heroes. To the left of the centre sits Zeus, on a

throne distinguished from the rest by a decorated arm; next him is Hera, raising her veil, with her attendant Iris standing beside her. Next is Ares, easily to be recognised by his impatient and impulsive gesture, as he clasps his raised knee with both hands. Then comes a group of two figures, male and female, whose relation is



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

EAST FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.

Maidens.

intimate; she is marked by her torch as Artemis and he can only be Apollo; he leans on the shoulder of another god, the last on this side, whose alert pose would suffice to identify him as Hermes, the messenger ever ready to start on his errand, even apart from the characteristic hat or petasus which he holds on his knee. On the right of the centre, the place of honour corresponding

to that of Zeus is held by Athena herself,¹ here disarmed for the peaceful ceremony over which she presides; she is in conversation with Hephæstus, who is distinguished by his strong muscles and the slightly awkward pose that hints discreetly at his lameness. Then comes a dignified bearded figure, who must be Posidon, grouped with a youthful god whose languid pose and soft and almost sensual type mark him as Dionysus.² Beyond him are two goddesses. The one at the end, against whose knee leans a winged boy holding a parasol, must be Aphrodite with Eros; for the other there are two possible identifications left — Hestia and Demeter.³ Neither should be omitted in such an assembly; but Hestia, though important in ritual, has little prominence in myth; and it is not easy to explain the absence of Demeter in a group which is evidently intended to be representative of the religion of the Athenian state.

¹ I give the accepted identification, though there is nothing apart from the position to show that this is Athena; even when the goddess lays aside her helmet she usually keeps her ægis. And it would be easy to call the figure Hestia, and to justify her position by the place of honour usually given her in sacrifice and her association with the hospitality of the state; the appropriateness of her association with Hephæstus is also obvious. In that case Athena would be absent from the frieze; perhaps her presence was sufficiently indicated by the great statue within the temple, visible through the great east door; her guests only would be on the frieze. It is stated in the B. M. catalogue that Athena holds the ægis folded in her lap, the snakes being visible; but the object is far from distinct, and has been variously interpreted.

² Furtwängler makes this figure and the next Apollo and Artemis, and puts Dionysus and Demeter in their place in the other group. The torch is equally suitable to Demeter; but the more vigorous and muscular form of the god there is not so suitable to Dionysus.

³ Unless this difficulty is avoided, as suggested in Note 1 above, by recognising Hestia in the figure usually called Athena.



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

EAST FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.

Group of gods.

If, however, we accept Demeter as the most probable name for this goddess, we must at the same time admit that she has little about her to suggest the goddess who was, in the fourth century, — though perhaps not in the fifth, — the most clearly characterised in art. For the mere purpose of identification, of course, a few ears of corn in the hand would have sufficed.

In the central space between the two groups of deities — a space on which they turn their backs as they look toward the advancing procession — a scene is being enacted which is variously explained. There are two principal figures, a man in a long-sleeved tunic reaching to his feet, and a woman in full and rich drapery. She is receiving a cushioned stool from off the head of one of two smaller female figures, the other carries a similar stool; he is occupied, with the help of a boy who stands before him, in folding up¹ a large piece of some heavy stuff. The subject here represented must be some ritual act con-

¹ I accept this, the B. M. catalogue (p. 78) description, as the only one accurately fitting the action of the figures. The only other possible explanation of the man's action is that he is inspecting the stuff, but that is less probable.



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

EAST FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.

Priest, priestess, and attendants, and group of gods.


nected with the Panathenaic festival. It need not, however, be necessarily the culminating act of that festival; for, although its position is central, we must notice also that the gods turn away from it, and that it seems to have no direct connection with the arrival of the procession. It seems, so to speak, to take place in the background, almost "behind the scenes"; and, although its place is apparently so conspicuous, it is set over the middle of the great door, where the sight of the statue within the temple would distract the eye of a spectator from it. It is more likely, then, to represent some act of preparation; some have suggested that the man represents merely a priest taking off his outer garment, but such a prominence is not usually given to vestments in Greek ritual, nor would the chief officiating priest be expected to perform any task so active as to require him to divest himself of his outer garment for the purpose. It has also been suggested that he is taking over or possibly inspecting formally the new peplos, which was regularly brought to offer to the goddess at the Panathenaic festival, but this explanation hardly suits his action; and the same objection applies to

Curtius' ingenious suggestion that the cloth is a carpet to be spread for the ceremonial entertainment offered to the gods. Otherwise this explanation would harmonise well with Professor Furtwängler's theory that the stools also were intended in the actual rite to invite and to symbolise the attendance of the gods, whom we see, as they presented themselves to the artist's imagination, on the frieze. Some allusion to the peplos is, however, certainly to be expected, and it is not to be found anywhere else in the frieze. Possibly we may here see the priest in the act of solemnly folding the old peplos to put it away, and so the scene implies the gift of the new one, which could not well be actually represented, since it was brought in the procession spread as the sail on the mast of a model ship.

Much has been written about the interpretation of the composition of the whole, the intention of the designer in his representation of the different scenes and groups, and their relation to the actual local distribution of the procession and the ritual acts that accompanied it. It has been suggested,¹ for example, that the north and south friezes are meant to represent the two sides of the same procession, and that on the east frieze we see the head of the procession split and spread out, so to speak, on either side, by a convention familiar in early art with objects seen from the front. In a similar manner it is suggested also that the group of gods are to be thought of as seated in a semicircle, in

¹ A. S. Murray, in *J.H.S.* II. 323.

the centre of which are the priest and priestess with peplos and stools, while the procession approaches them in a direct line. We have already seen reasons for doubting this last theory; the scene in the middle of the frieze is evidently not what the gods are looking at, for they turn their backs on it. And, altogether, it is to be doubted whether any so literal interpretation of conventions should be applied here. The problem set to the artist was to provide a continuous band of decoration within the colonnade round the temple, and the subject chosen was the Panathenaic procession and its reception by the gods. The gods were naturally placed over the chief door of the temple at the east end, looking toward the advancing procession; and to enable them to do this without the one group of gods turning their backs on the others, a scene of subordinate importance is inserted between the two. The procession could only approach the gods from the two ends of the east frieze, and at each end it turned the corner and was continued along the north and south sides. The duplication was merely a necessity of the field provided, and there is no need to see in it a conscious rendering of the two sides of the same procession—still less two different processions. There is, indeed, a certain amount of variety, as we have seen, which breaks the absolute symmetry, especially in the front part of the north and south friezes; but this is only in accordance with the artistic principles which we find throughout the Parthenon sculptures, and an apparent lack of symmetry is avoided by



devoting the west frieze to preparation, rather than to continuous advance.

The skill with which design and execution are adapted to architectural conditions is nowhere to be observed in higher perfection than in the Parthenon frieze. We have noticed, in the case of the metopes, how their position in the temple affected the distribution



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

WEST FRIEZE OF PARTHENON, IN SITU.

of subjects. In the case of the frieze also the usual approach of a visitor was considered. It is sometimes said that the frieze could never have been properly seen in its position in the building. This may be admitted only so far as to allow that details could not have been studied as conveniently as they can now in the British Museum. But to admit the statement as substantially

true would be to miss much of the essential character of the frieze; architect and sculptor alike intended it to be seen where it was placed, and adapted their work accordingly. It was, indeed, set high up, and received no direct light from above; but both disadvantages had their compensation. Seen between the columns of the outer colonnade, the procession would appear to one who walked along beside the temple from west to east to advance as he advanced, and this illusion was doubtless calculated. The excellent effect of an inner frieze, as seen through an outer colonnade, can best be appreciated from the view of the Theseum (p. 413). The question of lighting is more complicated, and evidently engaged the sculptor's careful attention. The light reflected from the white marble pavement below would be strong enough; and the low relief was calculated to make the best of it. The relief is higher at the top than at the bottom—about two and one-fourth inches on an average, as compared with one and a half inches,¹ and so the surface has a slight outward slope, and the lower outlines of the projecting masses are in every case deeper cut and steeper than the upper outlines, because they can depend on no shadows to assist their effect. One can easily realise the advantage of this process in many parts of the frieze where the upper outlines, now that they are lighted from above, are indistinct, while the lower ones are often too heavy.

¹ These measurements are taken from the B. M. catalogue, p. 66.

The extraordinarily low relief in which the frieze is executed was doubtless chosen partly because of this question of lighting, partly because it had to be seen from below and from comparatively near, so that any strong projection would have marred and confused the general effect. This low relief—an average, as we have seen, of less than two inches in depth, though the height is three feet four inches, a proportion of about 1:20—is used with the greatest skill, so as to represent without difficulty the team of a four-horse chariot, and the knights riding in some places as many as seven abreast. Nor is this effect mainly produced by drawing, such as could be used on a flat surface; where there are many figures side by side, the view of the series is taken, not from a position exactly perpendicular to the line of advance, but at a slight angle to the perpendicular, so that each figure slopes slightly in toward the background from front to back; and thus there is produced an illusion of depth beyond what is possible within the narrow limits of the relief. The technique is by no means uniform throughout; the modelling of the nude, the drapery, the treatment of the horses, and in particular of their manes, varies in different parts; it is even perhaps possible to distinguish the different hands, and to assign certain portions of the frieze to them. The more skilful have never been surpassed in technique; an example may be seen in the horses' heads from one of the chariot groups, chosen by Ruskin¹ to illustrate

¹ *Aratra Pentelici*, p. 174.

"what is meant by the virtue of handling in sculpture." "The projection of the heads of the four horses," he says, "one behind the other, is certainly not more, altogether, than three-quarters of an inch from the flat ground, and the one in front does not in reality project more than the one behind it, yet, by mere drawing, you see the sculptor has got them to appear to recede in due order, and by the soft rounding of



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

SOUTH FRIEZE OF PARTHENON.
Chariot.

the flesh surfaces and modulation of the veins, he has taken away all look of flatness from the heads. He has drawn the eyes and nostrils with dark incision, careful as the finest touches of a painter's pencil; and then, at last, when he comes to the manes, he has let fly hand and chisel with their full force; and where a base workman (above all, if he had modelled the thing in clay first) would have lost himself in laborious imitation of hair, the Greek has struck the tresses out with angular incisions, deep-driven, every one in appropriate place and deliberate curve, yet flowing so free under his noble hand that you cannot alter, without harm, the handling of any single ridge." We may see

the same or similar qualities of execution in many other parts of the frieze—in some of the knights, for example, and in some of the slabs with the restive cows and their escort. But pieces of such extraordinary merit are the exception. The frieze as a whole is rather characterised by a good general average of work, which suffices to give full effect to the design as a whole, and shows that by the time the frieze was made, there was working under Phidias a body of sculptors who had attained a very high degree of proficiency. At the same time, some of them even show a rather dry and mechanical manner; such may be seen, to some degree, in the slab with Posidon and Dionysus, where the excellent preservation of the surface makes it conspicuous, in contrast to the freedom and beauty of the design.

The question as to design and execution is thus brought prominently before us; and, in the case of pediments and frieze, the conditions are much the same, since both necessitate an actual amount of work beyond what it would be possible for one man to carry out, while both show a unity of conception and composition which implies that the design in general must be that of a single man, or, if not, of men working in the closest collaboration. With the metopes, as we have seen, the case is different. Allowing a general supervision over the distribution of subjects, which may have been due to the architect, probably in consultation with Phidias as artistic director of the whole, we may well

admit that each metope was designed and executed independently. Fortunately we have some information as to the practice of the Greeks in this matter. At Epidaurus we have the inscriptions giving the contracts for the building of the temple of Asclepius, including its sculptural decoration; and we find that the sculptor Timotheus—the same man who was later employed



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

GROUP OF THREE GODS.

From east frieze.

on the Mausoleum, and so one of the most eminent artists of his time—undertook two different contracts: to supply models (τύποι) for sculptures which must be those of the pediment, for the sum of 900 drachmas; and to supply acroteria for one gable for the sum of 2240 drachmas. These acroteria, which were found at Epidaurus, are two Nereids riding on horses, about

half life-size; there was probably a third figure on the apex of the gable, and we know from the Erechtheum inscription¹ that the sculptors employed in carving the figures to be affixed to it, of about the same size, got 60 drachmas a figure. It is a fair inference from these payments that the high sum paid for the acroteria at Epidaurus was given on condition that the sculptor should finish the figures himself and supply them in marble. The smaller sum which he received for the whole group of pedimental sculptures must have been for models only, probably in wax, and on a small scale — a mere sketch design from which the sculptors were to work; certainly not finished full-scale models which would leave to those who carved the marble figures a purely mechanical task. If we apply to the Parthenon what we learn from the Epidaurus inscription, we may fairly infer that the various metopes were probably undertaken and completed by several more or less independent artists, who merely conformed to a general scheme. But, in the case of the pediments and of the frieze, the unity of general design, coupled with the variety of execution, implies that these portions of sculptural decoration of the Parthenon were carried out from small models supplied by one man by different hands, trained to a certain uniformity of style and technique, but varying considerably in skill. Who the man was that supplied these models can hardly be a matter of doubt. We know that Phidias was intrusted with the general

¹ See p. 372, below.

supervision of the works at Athens under Pericles ; we cannot assign to any one else the commanding influence that trained a band of artists, at first barely free from the trammels of archaism, to work with a high degree of skill and a mastery of technique that has never been surpassed. The colossal gold and ivory statue of the goddess within the Parthenon was from his design. When we find also, in the sculpture decorating the same temple, great designs that harmonise with the whole scheme of temple and statue, and that themselves show a wonderful advance on anything that had before been attained in such great architectural compositions, it does not seem possible to attribute these designs to any other master than Phidias himself. This attribution, though it rests on no direct ancient authority, has been approved by the general consensus of modern times, and hardly admits of serious dispute.

The excellence of the architectural sculptures of the Parthenon, and the extent to which they are still preserved, give them a unique value for us. But we must remember that the Parthenon, like most other Greek temples, was intended in the first place to shelter and protect the statue which it contained. This statue of Athena Parthenos, the "Maiden Goddess" of Athens, was among the most famous statues of antiquity, and we possess both detailed descriptions of it and copies which enable us to understand and supplement these descriptions. At the same time, we cannot expect these copies to give us much help toward realising the artistic quali-

ties of the original or the impression which it produced. In the Athena Parthenos of Athens, as in the Zeus of Olympia, Phidias embodied the ideal type of the deity, as it presented itself to the Greeks; and he embodied it in such a form that, "while following the orthodox Greek conception, he added something to it," and that "no one in later times could without difficulty think of the deity in any other shape," to quote two only of the numerous eulogies of his work recorded by ancient writers. The higher imaginative qualities of his masterpieces we can only infer — so far as we can infer them at all — from the influence which he exercised on contemporary and later art; as to their type and execution we may learn something from the best of the sculptures made, under his direction, to decorate the building in which the colossal statue was to be set up, and from such other nearly contemporary works as give us some reflection of his style. We must, however, admit that the only statues which a Greek would have recognised as representative of the greatest sculptor of Greece are irretrievably lost, and that it is hopeless to try to recover them, except in accessories and external matters. With this reservation always in mind, let us attempt to obtain some general notion of the appearance of the statue in the surroundings for which it was designed. To help us in this attempt, we have, besides the descriptions of Pausanias and Pliny, which are fairly detailed, various copies of the statue, which unfortunately vary in artistic merit in inverse ratio to the completeness of their preservation.

Some of these tell us nothing but what we could assume without their help about any Phidian statue. The most important for our present purpose are an unfinished statuette, not without artistic merit, which was found in Athens, and is generally known as the Lenormant statuette; and a larger, more elaborate, and better - preserved figure, known from the place of its discovery in Athens as the Varvakeion statuette, which is of Roman workmanship of the basest and most mechanical sort. To them may be added a statuette found at Patras.¹ This, as well as the Lenormant statuette, has the advantage of giving, in part at least, the relief on the shield; this relief



ATHENA PARTHENOS — LENORMANT
STATUETTE.

is better preserved on the Strangford shield at the British Museum, which also shows traces of the painted design on the inside. The relief on the basis is indicated on the Lenormant statuette, and on the Pergamene copy.²

¹ Published by Mr. Cecil Smith in the *British School Annual*, III. Pl. ix.

² *Jahrb.* V. p. 114.


A visitor, on entering the Parthenon through the eastern door, would have the statue directly facing him; but the "dim religious light" of the interior — especially noticed by earlier travellers who saw the church before its destruction — would at first prevent him from seeing distinctly, unless he happened to have come early on the summer festival of the goddess, when the beams of the rising sun fell on her statue through the open door. As his eyes became used to the contrast from the bright sunlight without, the first impression he would receive of the colossal statue would probably be the extraordinary richness of its decoration and of its materials, and the contrast between the smooth white surface of the ivory and the broken glimmer of light on the embossed and inlaid surfaces of the gold. Then by degrees he would pass from such details to the contemplation of the statue as a whole, of the grandeur and nobility of the image in which Phidias had embodied the Goddess of Athens. Here we can only follow him imperfectly, by the help of our imagination; but we have a fairly complete notion how he might have described what he saw.

The statue was about thirty feet high, or thirty-eight including the basis.¹ The goddess was represented as standing, her right knee slightly bent and advanced so that the shape of the limb was modelled through the

¹ Pliny says 26 cubits (= 38 feet); the Victory was 4 cubits (= 6 feet), and it is about one-fifth of the height of the statue in the Varvakeion copy, which is probably mechanically accurate.



ATHENA PARTHENOS — VARVAKEION STATUETTE.



drapery, her weight resting on her left leg, which was concealed behind the heavy descending folds of her Doric chiton. This garment, of heavy texture, girt above the diplois, or upper fold, was the only one she wore; above it was the scaly ægis, covering only her shoulders and the upper part of her chest, with the gorgoneion set in the middle of it. On her head was a most elaborate helmet; it had a triple crest carried by a sphinx and two gryphons, the raised cheek pieces had a Pegasus in relief, and on the frontlet was a row of the fore parts of horses. This helmet, of which we can best judge the effect from gems and coins, and from a gold plaque found at Kertch, was a piece of ornate metal work such as one would associate with the name of a Benvenuto Cellini rather than of a Phidias; it illustrates the fact that Phidias was also famous as a fine worker in metal; Martial's repeated expression, —

"Phidiaci toreuma cæli"

is probably not purely conventional. But more than this, it shows that Phidias did not think this exercise of his skill out of place in the details of a colossal statue. The left hand of the goddess rested on her shield, and her spear was supported against it. Within the shield coiled the snake Erichthonios, and its external surface was embossed with a representation of the battle of the Greeks and Amazons. It was in this scene that Phidias is said to have introduced the figures of himself and Pericles which were made the basis of a charge of sacri-

lege against him; it is even stated that they were so cunningly affixed that they could not be removed without loosening the bonds that held the framework of the statue together. The two have been recognised on the Strangford shield, Pericles in the warrior whose arm half conceals his face, and Phidias himself in the bald-headed old man who swings an axe vigorously above his head.¹ On the inside of the shield was represented the battle of the Gods and Giants; traces of this subject have been found on the inside of the Strangford shield; this may well have been intended to reproduce the effect of a woven or embroidered lining.² Even the soles of the sandals were ornamented with a band of relief, representing the Lapiths and Centaurs; on the basis was an extensive composition, the creation of Pandora, in the presence of twenty deities. On the extended right hand of Athena was placed a figure of Victory, itself fully life-size.³ This extraordinary elabo-

¹ Plutarch says he held a stone; such a figure appears on the shield of the Lenormant statuette. The various copies differ, and none of them is to be taken as an exact reproduction. In the example from Patras the figures are smaller, and so better adapted to the field.

² So Cecil Smith, *l.c.*, p. 134.

³ The right hand and the Victory rest on a plain column in the Varvakeion statuette. It has been disputed whether this column existed in the original. It appears on two other copies, a coin and a relief, but in two different forms. If it was present in the original, it is difficult to explain Pausanias' silence about it, and also the absence of all decoration upon it. Possibly the weight of the Victory may have proved too much for the elaborate framework of the chryselephantine statue and consequently the arm may have had to be supported by a column added later; but if so, it is difficult to explain the various forms taken by the column in various copies. However this may be, it is practically certain that the column did not exist in Phidias' original design.

ration of details and accessories was in accordance with the precious nature of the materials employed — ivory for the nude parts, gold, possibly enriched with enamel, for the drapery and armour, and precious stones for the eyes. That the effect was rich and sumptuous in the extreme is evident from the descriptions that we possess; that it was also of marvellous beauty and of the highest and most ideal imagination we must infer from what we know of Phidias and from the unanimous verdict of antiquity.

The cella in which the colossal statue was placed was not bare of other things. We possess a series of inventories of the contents of the Parthenon, made by the various boards of treasurers as they handed them on from one to another. We are not surprised to find that these vary from time to time with the vicissitudes of the city; for Pericles, in his estimate of the resources of Athens, included not only the public and private dedications on the Acropolis, but even the gold of the chryselephantine statue itself. Among the objects recorded in the Hecatompedos Naos, the cella of the temple, at various times, are many golden crowns and rings and cups of various forms; a silver altar of incense and a silver bowl for lustral water; and a gold statue of Victory, which appears after the expulsion of the Thirty Tyrants and is conjectured by Michaelis¹ to have been dedicated from their confiscated property. The closed back chamber, the Parthenon proper, served

¹ *Parth.* p. 301.


rather as a storehouse, containing not only cups and crowns, arms and armour, chairs and beds, musical instruments, and other objects, but fragments broken from larger dedications, especially if they were of precious metal. The prodomus and the opisthodomus of the temple were also adapted to serve as treasuries by the insertion of bronze gratings which extended between the columns from floor to roof, those between the central columns being made to open and serve as gates. In the pronaos were cups and lamps, mostly of silver, and some crowns of gold. The opisthodomus, as we have already seen,¹ was used as the treasury of the state.

¹ See p. 222, above.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ERECHTHEUM AND THE TEMPLE OF VICTORY

IF the Parthenon shows us the perfection of Doric architecture, no less does the Erechtheum offer the most



ERECHTHEUM FROM THE SOUTH-EAST.

beautiful example of the Ionic order, and of the Ionic order in its Attic form, with an added grace and delicacy. The influence of the Erechtheum on later architecture has probably been the greater. For the beauty of the

Parthenon depends mainly upon subtle harmonies of proportion and mathematical exactness of curves, such as defied the imitation of later architects or masons; while the rich carvings of the Erechtheum and the ornate design of its parts could be copied with more or less success, and have served as models for classical buildings both ancient and modern. At the same time, the perfection with which the carving is executed is also beyond imitation, as may be seen when it is contrasted with the later repairs that are incorporated in the temple itself. Indeed, for mere fineness of execution in detail, it is surpassed by no classical building; the only things that can be compared to it are, perhaps, the Cnidian Treasury at Delphi and the finest of the Sidon Sarcophagi.

In order to understand the present state of the building, it is necessary to have some general notion of its history. We have already noticed the records of its building, damage, and repair in classical times. In Christian times it was turned into a church; the great north door was repaired, the western corridor was used as a narthex or ante-chapel, and the main part of the building was divided into a nave and aisles by rows of columns, of which the foundations still remain. An apse was constructed within the eastern portico, and a carved marble iconostasis was set up, of which some panels may still be seen in the temple. In Turkish times it served as the harem of the governor of Athens; to make an extra room the spaces between the columns of the north

portico were walled up. In this state we see it in Stuart's drawing. Lord Elgin carried off to London the most northerly column of the eastern portico, and also one of the Caryatides, which he replaced by a plain pillar; this pillar appears in views of the Erechtheum taken between his time and the Greek War of Independence. This seems perhaps the least defensible of his acquisitions, but his action was to a great extent justified by subsequent events. During the siege of the Acropolis by the Turks, in 1827, the roof of the north portico was destroyed, and the building was otherwise damaged. It was rebuilt to a certain extent between 1838 and 1846; the place of the Caryatid in the British Museum was supplied by a terra-cotta cast taken from the original; another was restored, mainly in marble, in a very tasteless manner; and the whole building was patched, partly with brick, partly with marble, into the rather motley state in which it now appears. Soon after this, in 1852, a storm blew down the engaged columns on the west end and the wall between them—a calamity the less to be deplored since these were themselves only a repair of Roman date. At the present time (1902) a project is on foot for rebuilding some more of the temple, especially of the north portico, with the help of original fragments still lying on the ground.

The plan of the Erechtheum is unique, and has given rise to much speculation. It was evidently partly due to the conformation of the ground, partly dictated by the necessity of including within a single building sev-

eral small shrines or sacred objects that did not readily fit into the normal plan of a Greek temple. The eastern part of the building is ordinary enough; it consists merely of an oblong cella faced by a portico of six Ionic columns; this is on the higher level. It joins at the back on to a chamber at a lower level, which had no direct access from outside, but opened at the west on a sort of broad corridor, which had windows to light it on the west, and was entered from the north and south ends by doors leading into projecting porticoes. The north portico, which was the principal entrance, was also the most richly ornamented part of the building; it contained the great door and was supported by six columns, four in the front and one at each side. The south porch was only entered from the west corridor by a small doorway, which gave access to a narrow staircase leading up to the higher level; its roof was carried by six richly draped "maidens," as they are called in the inventory, though the later term, Caryatides, is now generally applied to them.

It is generally agreed that the eastern cella is the temple of Athena Polias, built to hold her ancient wooden image, which was the centre of many ceremonies of the Athenian state religion. The western portion was the temple of Erechtheus, and contained many objects associated with his worship; before these can be considered it is necessary to describe this part of the Erechtheum rather more in detail. As to the central chamber, there is not much to be inferred from

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40


41


42


43

44

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1964
U. S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.








the extant remains.¹ Practically nothing can be traced except the level of its floor, which is the same as that of the north portico outside; the position of the wall which separated it from the eastern cella can be clearly seen, and also those of two different partitions separating it from the western corridor—one narrow, and therefore probably of wood, one broader, and therefore probably of marble. It is to be noticed that the original working of the surface up to a certain height is prepared to suit the narrower partition, which is slightly to the east of the other; but that in the upper courses holes are left for the bonding in of the upper part of the marble partition. It follows that the substitution of the marble for the wooden partition was a change made during the construction of the building. The difference of level between the eastern cella and the central chamber is about nine feet; but there is no indication to show whether there was a staircase joining the two, or, indeed, any communication between them. Beneath the floor of the central chamber there is just room for a crypt; but the surface of the rock is left in its natural state and shows no indication of any structures resting on it. On the other hand there is, in the north-west corner of this crypt, a door leading into a corresponding crypt below the north portico; and close to this door


¹ The foundations for rows of columns, dividing this chamber into a nave and aisles, date from later times, as may be seen by a glance at the materials of which they are constructed.

are some clefts in the rock which, as has recently been pointed out,¹ have some resemblance to the form of a trident. This may, as Dr. Nilsson suggests, be the *σχῆμα τριαύρης* which was shown to visitors in the Erechtheum, and associated with the tale of the contest between Athena and Posidon for the land.² On the other hand, this sacred object has usually hitherto been identified with some rather shapeless marks, such as might possibly have been made by a blow of a trident, in the rock just the other side of the door between the two crypts; and just above these marks there was a square hole, of which the edge may still be seen, in the pavement of the north portico, so that visitors could look down into the space beneath. Whichever of these be the authentic mark,—the words of Pausanias suit that pointed out by Dr. Nilsson better, while the architectural indications seem rather to fit the marks below the north portico,—the door between the two crypts may probably have had something to do with the exhibition or lighting of the symbol of Posidon. Beneath the western corridor is a large cistern, and this, though it shows traces of repair and reconstruction at various later dates, appears to have formed part of the original plan of the building. It was once roofed over by great blocks of marble, of which one end still remains, built in to form a course of the western wall, and cut on the outside to make a step; the other ends of these blocks rested on the


¹ By Dr. Nilsson, *J.H.S.* XXI. p. 325.

² See pp. 295–296.





THE ERECHTHEUM
SECTION FROM EAST TO WEST
LOOKING NORTH



ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
FROM FOUNDATION

foundation that carried the partition between the corridor and the central chamber. The arch now visible was substituted when those blocks were broken away. The cistern beneath was probably the *θάλασσα* formed by Posidon when he struck the rock with his trident; it is large enough to produce the sound of waves that was audible when the wind was in the south.

The west end of the building is of a very peculiar character, and shows certain features which are only explicable on the supposition that there were early precincts and structures in this region that could not be moved, and to which the new building had to be fitted and accommodated. One of these was the Pandroseum, in which the sacred olive tree of Athena grew; this we know to have been just outside the Erechtheum on the west; and its existence here was probably the reason why the Erechtheum, or at least its western portion, had to be entered from the north. There is a small door in the west corridor opening into the Pandroseum; and it was also approached by a door in the corner of the north portico, where it overlapped the north-western corner of the temple. There being no great door in the west wall, light had to be admitted in some way into the corridor and the chamber behind it. This was effected by making the west wall solid only to a height of about twelve feet above the floor; on this low wall rested a row of columns. The appearance of the western end of the temple, as it stood before it was blown down by the

storm of 1852, may be realised with the help of Stuart's sketch. Between the columns were square windows in the three central intercolumniations. This arrangement, however, if ancient at all, does not go back beyond Roman times; for the workmanship of the fallen columns that stood on the wall is evidently a later imitation, similar in style to that we see in the temple of Rome and Augustus. The shape of these columns is peculiar; they are adapted to being built into a wall, and may more accurately be described as attached semi-columns, set against square pillars, not unlike what we see in the proscenia of theatres. This form had not yet been developed at the time when the Erechtheum was built; and it is probable that the columns set up on the wall, which preceded these Roman substitutes, and are mentioned in the inventory of 409 B.C., were complete columns of the usual form.


The construction of the south-west corner of the temple is peculiar; on the southern side of this corner is the Caryatid portico, which is called in the inventory *ἡ πρόστασις ἡ πρὸς τῷ Κεκροπίῳ*,¹ "the portico in front of the Cecropium." This portico is built on the foundations of the peristyle of the Old Temple; and there is in the west wall of the Erechtheum a huge

¹ The dative with *πρὸς* here implies that the Cecropium was within the temple. In similar expressions, when the allusion is to something outside, the genitive is used; e.g. *ὁ πρὸς τοῦ Πανδροσείου τοῖχος* or *ἀετός*, "the wall or pediment turned toward the Pandroseum." But the usage cannot be pressed too strictly; for this very corner is also called *ἡ γωνία ἡ πρὸς τοῦ Κεκροπίου*, and the portico in front of the great door is called *ἡ πρόστασις ἡ πρὸς τοῦ θυρώματος*.



THE ERECHTHEUM FROM THE WEST.

On right, foundation of peristyle of early temple, and Parthenon above it; in front, on left, Acropolis wall; on right, Mycenaean houses.



block of marble,—the largest in the whole building,—one end of which rests on this same foundation. Beneath the middle of this block there is a vacant space, now partly filled by a rough pillar recently constructed to support it where it is cracked. The purpose of this arrangement must have been to support the weight of the south-west corner of the Erechtheum without disturbing some object below it that had to be respected; and the inventory shows us that this object was the Cecropium—probably a small vaulted tomb of primitive structure, which has now completely disappeared. In the upper part of this same corner there is a curious recess in the south wall, perhaps indicating a gallery at this level, and some indication that there was a door, at the same high level, through the most southerly intercolumniation of the west wall; this would presumably have led on to the roof of a portico bordering the Pandroseum on its south side. This is practically all the evidence that can be gathered from the building in its present state as to the nature and purpose of its different parts. We may gather something more from the inventory of the finished and unfinished portions of the building in 409 B.C., and from the accounts of the continuation of the work in the following years; but these descriptions are intended to assist the commissioners in the identification of the various blocks, not to state the purpose of different parts of the building, and consequently are not so instructive, from this point of

view, as we might have hoped. Almost the only object of any importance that they mention, and that is not otherwise known to us, is the altar of the *Θυηχόος* in the north portico. . Pausanias, on the other hand, mentions a good many things he saw in the temple. He appears to have entered the building by the north portico and the great door, and he saw within—that is to say, in the west corridor—three altars, one of Posidon, on which they also sacrificed to Erechtheus by command of the oracle, one of the hero Butes, and one of Hephæstus; and on the walls were paintings of the family of the Butadæ. He was also shown the salt spring and the trident mark. Within the temple of Athena Polias, which, as we have seen, probably occupied the eastern division of the building, he saw not only the ancient image said to have fallen from heaven, but also the lamp made by Callimachus, which had a palm tree as its chimney, and burnt all the year with one filling of oil, an ancient Hermes completely covered with myrtle boughs, a stool made by Dædalus, and some Persian spoils from the battle of Plataea, the breastplate of Masistius, and the dagger of Mardonius. It appears from the order of his description that he must have been able to pass from the western to the eastern part of the building without going outside. Another piece of topographical evidence in this connection is the story told by Philochorus¹ of a certain dog, which “entered the

¹ Apud Dionys. Hal. *de Din.* 13.

temple of Athena Polias, descended into the Pandroseum, and then leapt up on to the altar of Zeus Herkeios under the olive tree and lay down there." This beast may have proceeded by the gallery and door of which we notice some indications above the southwest corner of the Erechtheum.

The information derived from these sources is not easy to interpret and to piece together; and certain things about the building—especially the purpose and arrangement of the central chamber—must remain uncertain. We have already noticed that it is not easy to ascertain whether there was an earlier building on the site of the Erechtheum. Perhaps, in view of the various devices we have noticed for including the various sacred objects that existed in this region, and for providing communication between them, it is more probable that these objects stood originally in an open precinct, and that the present Erechtheum was the first attempt to give them an architectural frame. It is possible, moreover, as Professor Furtwängler suggests, that the internal divisions of the temple may also have been affected by the necessity for providing similar accommodation, for ritual purposes, to that which had existed in the old Hecatompædon or Temple of Athena—that temple in which Athena had placed Erechtheus, and shared her worship with him, or where, according to another version, the rival cults of Athena and Posidon were reconciled with a single building. It is certainly a curious coincidence that the Erech-

theum, like the Old Temple, had a central chamber, entered from the west, though there is no clear evidence to show that this chamber was also divided into a northern and southern portion, like the corresponding room in the Old Temple;¹ and when we consider how much modification of plan the western part of the Erechtheum has undergone to fit it to its local surroundings, it would be rash to make any inferences on this matter. It seems clear, however, from the level, that the central chamber forms part of the western portion, or Erechtheum proper, rather than of the eastern portion, or temple of Athena Polias.

The nomenclature of the temple is rather confusing; its official title in the inventory is ὁ νεὼς ἐν ᾧ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἄγαλμα, "the temple containing the ancient image"; and the names Erechtheum and Temple of Athena Polias, which belong properly to its western and eastern portions respectively, are each of them sometimes, in common speech, applied to the whole building, just as the name Parthenon came to be applied to the whole temple instead of to its western chamber. There is no need to let this apparent confusion affect our notion of the purpose and use of the building. The eastern cella, or temple of Athena Polias, was built to house the ancient image fallen from heaven, which had once been set up in the Old Temple, which Phidias had perhaps intended to transfer to the Parthenon, and which finally, under more

¹ The words of Pausanias, διπλοῦν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ οἶκημα, do not, in their context, suggest this meaning.

conservative influences, found a home almost on the same spot where it had always been worshipped. This image was the centre of all the most sacred and ancient religious rites of the Athenian state. For it the peplos was woven to be presented at the Panathenaic festival; and it was taken in solemn procession to be dipped in the sea at the Plynteria. The priestess of Athena was especially concerned with the worship in this temple, and close to it were the rooms where the *ἐργαστῖναι* wove the peplos under her direction, and where the two Arrhephoric maidens lived for their year of service before they went on their mysterious errand to carry to the cleft in the earth, near the gardens, the box which they might not open. In the Pandroseum, too, which may have had some direct communication with the temple of Athena, perhaps by a gallery along the south wall of the Erechtheum, was the sacred olive tree of Athena, and beneath this was the altar of Zeus Herkeios, probably representing the original altar in the court of the house of Erechtheus, which was identical with the earliest temple of Athena. The rest of the temple, the Erechtheum proper, was given up to the worship which was here associated with that of Athena; her rival, Posidon, is here identified with her favoured hero, Erechtheus, an identification expressly ratified by the oracle which ordered that sacrifice should be offered to both upon the same altar. The priest attached to this cult was one of the descendants of the hero Butes, the Butadæ or Eteobutadæ, whose paintings were seen in this part of the

temple by Pausanias. The close association of this cult with the sacred olive is attested by the fact that when the Epidaurians requested from Athens some wood from the olive tree to make statues of in accordance with an oracle, it was granted on condition of their offering an annual sacrifice to Athena Polias and to Erechtheus. We have already noticed the arrangements in this part of the Erechtheum for the preser-



PART OF NORTH PORTICO OF ERECHTHEUM.

vation and exhibition of the trident mark and of the salt pool. It is said that the guardian snake of the Acropolis, sometimes supposed to represent Erichthonius, also had its quarters here. The Erechtheum, in fact, was a visible symbol of the reconciliation of the rival cults, and contained a recognition of all their essential features, while the Parthenon, by its sole dedication to Athena and its express declaration of her victory, tended, perhaps too much for the orthodox and conservative religion of the day, to subordinate all other cults to hers.

The two buildings supplement each other as much in their religious significance as in their architectural types.

The Erechtheum, as has already been said, may be taken as a representative of the most refined form of Ionic architecture. The order differs in several



CAPITAL OF COLUMN, NORTH PORTICO OF ERECHTHEUM.

respects both from the pure Ionic form, as we see it in Asia Minor, and from the later conventional Ionic.



BASE OF COLUMN, NORTH PORTICO OF ERECHTHEUM.

Behind it, wall showing base moulding.

It is also different from the simpler kind of Ionic which we see in the Propylæa and in the temple of Nike. The entablature consists of an architrave surmounted by a

richly decorated moulding, and divided into three bands, each slightly projecting beyond the other; a frieze of

black Eleusinian stone, which served as the background to a set of white marble figures in relief, to which we must later recur; and an ornamental cornice: but the dentils, which are often considered as characteristic of the Ionic entablature, are here entirely absent. The capital has a deep and delicately profiled groove, subdividing the broad channel between the volutes into two approximately equal portions; this groove, which has a curve intermediate between the flattened top of the channel and the deep bend of its lower boundary, runs round the two volutes



BAND OF CARVING, FROM TOP OF WALL OF ERECHTHEUM.

also; and, as the space below the curved boundary of the channel is also continued into the volutes, these really consist of three spirals wound to-

gether. Into the innermost of the three was fixed a bronze spiral, which terminated in the angle between channel and volute, on each side of the capital, in a bronze palmette; a painted or carved palmette often appears in this position on less ornate capitals. The centres of the volutes also had metal ornaments, probably of bronze gilt. Above the egg and dart moulding which usually crowns the shaft of an Ionic column

between the volutes, the Erechtheum columns have also a round torus ornamented with a rich plait; in the north portico, which is the most ornate part of the building, this plait is pierced in its interstices with holes for the insertion of a bright enamel. Beneath the capital the Ionic flutings, with the flat fillets between them, do not begin immediately; but above them is a band of flat relief, with one of those beautiful palmette and flower patterns that occur on various parts of the temple. The base consists only of an upper and lower torus separated by a deeply curved groove; there is no square plinth below it. In the columns of



"CARYATIDS" OF ERECHTHEUM.

the eastern front the upper torus is simply reeded; but in the north portico it has a rich plait pattern like that round the head of the shaft, also diversified, in some cases, by holes for the insertion of enamel. The walls were treated externally in much the same manner as the columns and antæ; above the highest of the three steps, all around the building, is a base moulding similar to the bases of the columns; and the wall is crowned by a band of palmettes and flowers like

those round the necks of the columns, carved with a crispness and delicacy that have never been surpassed. The southern or "Caryatid" portico has an especial design suited to the nature of its supports. The entablature carried by the maidens is lightened by the omission of the frieze, though, as some compensation, the uppermost of its three bands is decorated with a row of discs. The six figures stand, four in front and one behind at each side, upon a low marble wall, not broken by a door (the entrance is concealed at the side); and they are so disposed as to give the utmost appearance of rest and stability; each rests her weight on the outer leg; and thus, together with an appearance of ease and absence of strain, there is, so to speak, a centripetal effect similar to that gained by the slight inward inclination of the outer columns of a Doric temple; one has only to imagine the position of the figures on either side of the centre interchanged, to realise how disquieting to the eye any other arrangement would be. The maidens are clothed in full and rich drapery, like that of the Athenian maidens on the Panathenaic frieze, with cloaks hanging from their shoulders, and their hair is arranged in solid plaits beside their necks, so as to increase their apparent strength as architectural supports.

The Erechtheum had, as we have seen, several doors;¹

¹ Fragments of the ornamental moulding of another door, similar in character to the great one, are preserved; these have usually been attributed to the east door. Dr. Middleton restores them as belonging to the small west door into the Pandroseum. See Schultz, *J.H.S.* XII. 1. Even if we reject Mr. Schultz's theory as to the jambs, the evidence he points out of the lintel and cornice being replaced is indisputable.

the one which was distinguished by the especial name of τὸ θύρωμα was the door in the north portico, which is happily still standing, though in a much damaged condition. Its great lintel is broken, and supported by an interior lintel and jambs of Christian date; and even this great lintel and the cornice above it, though of Greek workmanship, have a carved ornament different in style from that on the original jambs and on the walls, and are evidently due to a repair, possibly necessitated by the fire of 406 B.C.; the original lintel, of which the ends still remain, was of the height of two ordinary courses, and rested on the wall on either side. Yet, allowing for these repairs, the doorway remains, as an architectural model, the most perfect that is known to us from classical times, as well as the earliest elaborate marble doorway that we possess—for it will be remembered that the Parthenon and the Propylæa had their great doors bordered with wooden jambs. The wonderfully delicate row of carving that surrounds the door, the rosettes on the outer band, their centres filled with gilt bronze knobs, the console (one only is left), and the cornice even in its present state, combine to give a harmony and richness of effect that may be all the better appreciated for a comparison of the original with the countless imitations of it that may be seen in classical and modern work. On every part of this exquisite little temple there has been lavished a profusion of ornament, a richness of carving and inlaying, that, in any other time or place, might well have been bewildering or even surfeiting to the

eye. It is the peculiar excellence of the Attic artists of the fifth century that they could not only produce the simple and severe perfection of the Parthenon, but also combine the rich ornamentation of the Erechtheum with so great a purity and distinction of workmanship.

The frieze of the Erechtheum calls for more detailed attention because of its peculiar technique. Earlier friezes—including that of the Parthenon—had had their backgrounds painted with a dark colour, usually blue, against which the figures stood out distinctly. A different technique was suggested by the basis of the statue of the Olympian Zeus, on which the figures of gold and ivory were attached to a background of black Eleusinian stone. In the Erechtheum the frieze was made of this same black stone, and on its slabs may still be seen the clamps and clamp-holes by which the figures, in this case of white Pentelic marble, were attached to the background. Some of the figures themselves are preserved; they are in moderately high relief. The extant figures, and the indications of their position on the ground of the frieze, have not, however, sufficed to indicate either the subject represented or the nature of the composition. This frieze has an additional interest from the fact that we still possess, on one of the inscriptions relating to the building of the temple, a record of the various sums paid to workmen for carving the various figures of which it was composed.¹

¹ See p. 342.

The little temple of Victory, or rather of Athena Nike, has undergone vicissitudes even stranger than the larger buildings on the Acropolis. We have already noticed that the decree which ordered it to be built was one of the earliest measures passed during the predominance of Pericles, but that its completion was delayed, for some reason which is not recorded, until a later date—



TEMPLE OF ATHENA NIKE FROM THE NORTH-EAST.

how much later, we can only judge from the style of the sculpture that decorated it. Once completed, it appears to have stood intact until comparatively modern times, and it was seen and admired by early travellers, such as Wheler. So it remained until 1687, when Athens was threatened by Morosini's attack, which ended so disastrously for the Parthenon; and the Turks, in order to strengthen the defences of the Acropolis,

erected a new bastion, which they constructed in part out of the material of the temple of Nike, which they pulled down for the purpose. The appearance of the west front of the Propylæa, with a vacant space where the temple stood, is shown in Stuart's drawing.¹ Lord Elgin found some slabs of the frieze built into late walls, and carried them to England, where they may now be seen in the British Museum; but the whole of the temple was not recovered until the bastion erected in 1687 was pulled down in 1835-36. The temple was found to be practically complete; and Ross, who was then Director of Antiquities in Greece, decided to rebuild it upon its original foundations; this he did, and the temple, as restored, has again become a familiar feature in the view of the Acropolis. From a distance its effect is much what it always was; but it was of course impossible to put together the old stones of the temple with the precision that distinguishes fifth-century architecture, and consequently, on a near view, the impression produced is rather irregular and unsatisfactory. The pieces of the frieze taken to London have been replaced by terra-cotta casts, as in the case of the Erechtheum.

The temple is of very simple plan, consisting merely of a small oblong cella, facing east, with a portico of four Ionic columns at its front and back. It is raised on two steps, of which the lower one, at the west end, is aligned with the west wall of the bastion on which

¹ See p. 219.

the temple is placed; it is set in the north-west corner of this bastion, so as to leave a triangular space between the temple and the north edge of the bastion, and a rectangular space on the south.

The Ionic order, as seen in this temple, is practically identical with that of the Propylæa; it has the simple form of capital, with a plain channel and single spiral in the volute, and with the fluting of the columns continuing right up to the capital. The sculptured frieze of the order has, for the most part, been preserved. On the



SLAB OF SOUTH FRIEZE OF TEMPLE OF NIKE.
Greeks and Persians.

east front is an assembly of the gods, some seated, some standing. Athena, and probably Zeus, are recognisable, but the figures are so much defaced that it is impossible to identify many of the others. On the north and south sides were represented combats between Greeks and Persians, easily distinguishable by their muffled heads and the drapery swathed round their limbs; on the west end was a combat between Greeks and Greeks. It has been suggested with much probability that these three scenes are to be taken as typical and commemorative of the three great battles of the Persian Wars, Marathon and Salamis, in which the Athenians overcame the

Persians, and Plataea, where it fell to the lot of the Athenians to meet the Thebans, then fighting on the Persian side. In the earlier days of the Peloponnesian War the Athenians would probably have been glad of this opportunity to record the national apostasy and disgrace of their Theban enemies. If this explanation is right, each side of the temple appropriately faces the direction of the field where the battle it records was fought. To the south, from the Nike bastion, one looks over the sea and Salamis; to the west a conspicuous object is Cithæron, just behind which lies Plataea; and to the north is the pass between Pentelicus and Parnes, by which the Athenians returned from Marathon. Thus the visible objects in the landscape on each side suggested the required associations.

The style of the sculpture is, as has been said, the chief evidence for the date of the temple. It cannot possibly be so early as 450 B.C., the latest date to which the inscription can be assigned; indeed, it is evidently later than the sculptures of the Parthenon or of the Theseum. There is a freedom and ease, both in the composition of the groups and the pose of the individual figures, which can belong only to a post-Phidian epoch; but at the same time there is a certain restraint and moderation in the use of this freedom, which forbids us to assign the work to a much later date. Certain characteristics, such as the picturesqueness of effect and the flowing sweep of line in some of the groups, suggest the influence of painting, such as might well be attrib-

uted to Polygnotus and his scholars, at this time working in Athens; but it is not likely that we should find this influence in a work of sculpture earlier than the Parthenon: had sculptors of such skill as is shown in this frieze already existed in Athens, it is hardly conceivable that such men as made the metopes, for example, of the Parthenon and the Theseum should still have been employed on the chief buildings. Though their originality and vigour are, perhaps, greater than we find in the sculptors of the Nike frieze, their employment instead of those sculptors would have been an archaistic anachronism such as the Athenians of Pericles' time would not have tolerated.

Another well-known series of sculptures that is associated with the temple of Athena Nike is the frieze ornamenting the balustrade or parapet that was placed around the bastion or precinct on which the temple stood. This precinct was of an irregular shape; the balustrade began beside the little staircase leading up from the space before the Propylæa, and extended along the north, west, and south sides of the bastion, where traces of its fixing can still be seen; its slabs have been removed to the Acropolis Museum. The reliefs which decorated it were placed upon the outside, so that some of them were only visible at some considerable distance from below. The slabs of relief are about one metre in height; they were surmounted by a bronze railing of which the traces are still visible on the slabs. The subject of the frieze is a series of acts of worship performed in

honour of Athena — who is present on each side — by a number of winged Victories ; some lead a cow to sacrifice, others deck trophies or bring the spoils of the vanquished. But the theme is used by the sculptor as an opportunity for the display of a number of beautiful female figures.



By permission of Messrs A. W. Mansell & Sons.

SLAB FROM BALUSTRADE OF TEMPLE OF NIKE.

Two Victories and a cow.

in varied and graceful action, their forms set off by drapery that clings, as if wet and transparent, to their body and limbs, or is swept by their motion into rich curving folds. It is impossible not to admire the skill of the artist and the beauty of the effect which he has attained ; but the mere fact that he has aimed at suc

an effect contrasts with the directness and simplicity of work that mark the sculptures of the Phidian age. It seems as if the Attic sculptors, left to their own devices, were again affecting a delicate treatment of drapery analogous to the mannerism that we noticed in their work before the robber influences that came in with the Persian Wars. We have only to compare the two Victories leading a cow to sacrifice with the slab in the Parthenon frieze representing an almost identical subject, to feel what a great gulf is fixed between the two.



SLAB FROM BALUSTRADE OF TEMPLE OF NIKE.
Victory loosening her sandal.

Yet the sculpture of the balustrade is admirable in its kind, and it would be unfair to attribute to it the rather frigid mannerisms that mar the delicacy and prettiness of the sculptures of the Nereid Monument at Xanthus, of the Neo-Attic Reliefs, and of count-

less other imitations, ancient and modern, that are ultimately derived from this same frieze of winged Victories. As a work of decorative relief, rich in flowing line and varied waves of drapery and beauty of body and limb that glow "through the veil that seems to hide them," the Nike balustrade holds an unrivalled place; and if, on the one hand, it stands at the head of a series of imitations that are already on the way to decadence, yet, in the purity and dignity of its types, and the absence of confusion or over-elaboration in its detail, it preserves the high traditions of the fifth century.

CHAPTER IX

THE CITY IN THE FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURIES

IN comparison with the fairly complete notion which we can obtain of the appearance of the Acropolis in the fifth and fourth centuries, our knowledge of the lower city is very meagre. This is partly, no doubt, because the architectural activity that distinguished the time of Cimon and Pericles was mainly concentrated on the adornment of the sacred citadel; but it is partly also due to the fact that, while the Acropolis has been completely excavated and now stands clear of all later structures, the site of the Agora and many of the more important buildings below lies in the region that has always been occupied; it is indeed still covered by the small houses and streets that survive, even in modern Athens, as a heritage of Turkish times. It is greatly to be regretted, from the archæological point of view, that Ross's bold and far-seeing plan to clear away all these small streets and houses, and to build the new city entirely in the district now occupied by the broad streets of the modern quarters, was never carried out. There would indeed have been some loss of the picturesque effect; but the bazaars and other characteristic features

of Turkish Athens seem in any case doomed to disappearance; and in their place we might have had the excavated area of the most central districts of the ancient city. It must be admitted that, wherever excavation in this region has been possible, it has not led to any very satisfactory results; the continued occupation seems here, as is often the case, to have led to the almost complete obliteration of ancient monuments; but such partial excavations are always a lottery, and indications of great topographical importance may well lie hidden within a few feet of an unsuccessful trial-pit. The Theseum, the Theatre, and the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates are practically the only monuments of the fifth or fourth century that still remain visible above ground.

When the Athenians returned to their city after it had been sacked by the Persians, they found, as Thucydides tells us, only some parts of the wall left and most of the houses fallen; only a few survived, in which the Persian leaders had taken up their quarters. The first care of the Athenians on returning was to rebuild their walls; and when even this essential matter was carried out in a rough-and-ready way, by making use of any available material, it is not likely that much trouble was bestowed either on private houses or public buildings; the Athenians probably contented themselves with provisional restorations to meet their practical needs. As soon as they had leisure to restore or replace in a permanent form what the Persians had destroyed,

they turned, as we have seen, to the building of the new temple of Athena on the Acropolis; but, so long at least as the influence of Themistocles was predominant, it was unlikely that the public buildings in the lower town would be sumptuously rebuilt. Such a measure would have been inconsistent with his project of removing the town bodily to the Piræus; if this project had been carried out, the Acropolis would have remained as the old sacred precinct, like the Heræum of Argos, some distance away from the inhabited city. Many porticoes, temples, and other buildings, some of them with paintings referring to the Persian Wars, were built around the Agora or elsewhere about this time; but they must in all probability be referred to the administration of Cimon, after the projects of Themistocles had been discredited with his disgrace and exile in 472 B.C. We have already noticed the works undertaken by Cimon on the Acropolis between his crowning victory over the Persians at the Eurymedon in 468 B.C. and his ostracism in 461 B.C., and also his design and partial completion of the Long Walls between Athens and the Piræus. The chief buildings of the lower town must probably be assigned to this same period. It has been conjectured with great probability that during his campaigns on the coast of Asia Minor he had fallen under the influence of the Ionian culture and artistic tendencies; and that when he had an opportunity for beautifying Athens with new buildings, he summoned artists from Ionia to his assistance — chief among them the

painter Polygnotus, whose work, or that of his assistants and pupils, was to be seen in many of the buildings that may be attributed to Cimon, and whose influence on the art of Greece in the period succeeding the Persian Wars it would not be easy to overrate. In sending for Ionian artists, Cimon was in some respects merely following the example of Themistocles, who had employed the Milesian architect Hippodamus to lay out the new plan of the Piræus, after the sumptuous and regular style customary in the great Ionian cities. But in Athens itself there was probably no scope for so complete an innovation; the older buildings around the Agora were already associated with their sites by a long tradition, and the new porticoes and temples that were built by Cimon consequently had to be adapted in plan and position to conditions already pretty rigidly prescribed. The only region where much freedom was possible was in the approach leading to the Agora from the Dipylon Gate; and here the broad and gently sloping Dromos, bordered on either hand by the Long Porticoes, may probably be ascribed to Cimon's design. We possess, unfortunately, no certain remains or record of any of the buildings erected by Cimon in the lower city, unless the beautiful little Ionic temple near the Ilissus, drawn by Stuart, but now entirely destroyed, be attributed to his time. Stuart gives both a picturesque view of this temple as he saw it, and also an architectural restoration and drawings of its details. Its chief peculiarity lies in the fact that, while otherwise resembling the temple of

Nike, it has a plain architrave in place of the triple one usually belonging to the Ionic order, — perhaps an Attic experiment that was not repeated. The temple, which stood on a site between the Stadium and Callirrhoe, close to the Ilissus, has been variously identified as the temple of Demeter or of Triptolemus in Agræ, or as the temple of Artemis Agrotera. The latter identification fits the period, since this goddess was associated with the victory of Marathon, and received an annual sacrifice of five hundred goats in commemoration of it; but it is probable enough that a small temple such as this may not be among those recorded by ancient writers. Another temple, said to have been dedicated from the spoils of the Persians at Marathon, was that of Eucleia, probably an epithet of Artemis; but whether this is to be looked for by the Ilissus or not depends on the interpretation of Pausanias, since it is mentioned as near Enneacrunus. The name Eucleia, in itself, is more suitable to a temple near the Agora, as is shown by the analogy of similar dedications in Bœotia. If we could be certain of the identification and the date of this Ionic temple by the Ilissus, it might be valuable as the earliest temple of the Ionic order known to us in Athens.¹ Apart from it, the earliest of which we know the erection to have been ordered is the temple of Nike, designed by Callicrates, who served as city architect under Cimon and built the Long Walls. It is probable that the same Ionic order

¹ Unless we accept Mr. Penrose's restoration of the early temple of Athena. See J. H. S. XII. 275.

may have been used in some of Cimon's porticoes, at least, as in the Propylæa, for the internal columns. Except in the case of these porticoes or other buildings which can be dated by the paintings with which they were decorated, we have no certain criteria to prove which of them were built by Cimon. All we can assert is that it seems improbable that they were erected before his time, and that they are often referred to as already existing, in some cases as places of traditional respect, in the latter part of the fifth or in the fourth century B.C. If it is convenient to group them all together here, it must be understood that there is no clear evidence that they are all contemporary. All that is certain is that they existed, as described here, at least during the later part of the period with which we are concerned in the present chapter.

Perhaps there is no building of equal historical and artistic importance of which so little is known as the Stoa Basileios or King's Portico. It was the office of the magistrate called the king, and therefore the scene of Plato's *Euthyphro*, the first act of the drama of the Trial and Death of Socrates. In later times it was the place where the Court of Areopagus sat; in it or before it were set up the tablets of the laws, and here, too, was the stone of sacrifice on which the archons took their oath. The Stoa Basileios is also conjectured, by some authorities, to have given its form as well as its name to the Basilica, and so to the Christian church. It was the first building on the western side of the Agora, seen by one

approaching from the Dipylon Gate, and therefore it must have stood just at the foot of the little mound on which the Theseum is situated. Some early foundations found beneath modern houses at this point were identified, when they were first discovered, as probably forming part of the Stoa Basileios; but on being more completely cleared, they proved to belong to a plan resembling that of a temple; and so the identification cannot be considered probable.¹ Presumably the Stoa Basileios, like most other porticoes, consisted of a wall at the back and a colonnade facing the Agora, with one or more internal rows of columns between: but it must also have had some other arrangements to provide the accommodation necessary to its various uses. In the case of the Court of Areopagus at least, these were supplemented by an enclosure temporarily roped off to secure the required seclusion.² The only recorded fact about its decoration is that it had above its roof groups of terra-cotta, representing Theseus hurling Sciron into the sea and Eos carrying off Cephalus,—both of them familiar subjects in Attic art.

Beside or behind the Stoa Basileios was another portico, called the Stoa Eleutherios, apparently from its association with the statue of Zeus Soter or Eleutherios, that stood near it. These epithets of the god, according to the most probable explanation, are to be connected,

¹ See Dörpfeld, *Ath. Mitth.* XXI. 108, XXII. 225.

² Dem. in *Aristogit.* I. 23: τὸ τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν, ὅταν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ στοᾷ καθεζομένη περισχοινοῖσθται, κατὰ πολλὴν ἡσυχίαν ἐφ' αὐτῆς εἶναι.

at Athens as at Plataea, with the Persian Wars and the great deliverance of the Greeks from the danger of a foreign yoke. This portico was a favourite place of resort for those idling in the market-place, and was, for that reason, frequented by philosophers,—for instance, Diogenes the cynic. Its position in this region is confirmed by the discovery, in the railway cutting, between the Theseum and the Hermes Street, of an inscription, ordered to be set up beside Zeus Soter. The paintings in the Stoa were by Euphranor, and so cannot have been executed until the fourth century. The third and most famous of these great porticoes in the Agora of the fifth and fourth centuries was probably on its eastern side; this was built by Pisianax, probably a relative of Cimon and uncle of Alcibiades, and was sometimes called by his name; but it is better known as the *Στοὰ Ποικίλη*, the Painted Colonnade, because of the fresco-paintings that decorated it, and that were, perhaps, second only to those of the Lesche at Delphi in fame throughout the ancient world. It is said that Polygnotus painted his share of this portico without any payment; the other scenes were painted by Micon and by Panænus, the brother of Phidias. The subjects were the battle between the Athenians and Spartans at the Argive Cēnoe, probably about 460 B.C.; the battle of the Athenians under Theseus against the Amazons, painted by Micon; the Greeks after the capture of Troy, a subject similar to that in the Lesche at Delphi, and painted by Polygnotus himself (in it Ajax and Cassandra were conspicuous);

and the victory of the Athenians and Plataeans¹ over the Persians at Marathon, attributed variously to each of the three artists already mentioned, — a fact which suffices to show that Micon and Panæus imitated Polygnotus in their style. The battle seems to have been divided into three scenes, — the two enemies approaching one another, the flight of the Persians to the marsh, and their slaughter as they regained their ships. Various gods and heroes were represented as present, Athena and Heracles and Theseus, and the hero named Echetlos, who was represented as slaying the Persians with a ploughshare. Among the generals the figures of Miltiades, who stood forth conspicuous, and of Callimachus on the Greek side, and of Datis and Artaphernes on the Persian side, were portraits; the poet Æschylus also could be recognised among the combatants, and his brother, Cynægeirus, who lost his hand when seizing a Persian ship. Even a dog which accompanied his master into battle was included in the picture. This representation of the battle of Marathon was one of the most famous among the historical pictures, and it was constantly before the eyes and the minds of the Athenians as a memorial of their proudest exploit. It is interesting to notice that they did not shrink from representing, in painting, incidents and accessories derived from the actual facts of the battle, though also dignified by the assistance of gods and heroes; in contemporary sculpture, as we have seen, references to the victory over the Persians are usually

¹ See Frazer, *Paus.* note *ad loc.*

expressed only in a symbolical or typical manner, by representations such as the combat of the Greeks and Centaurs.

The Painted Stoa, like the other two, was in the most frequented portion of the Agora; sometimes it served for the meetings of a court, always for a public resort and the disputation of the philosophers. Owing to this last use it has given its name to the Stoics, who were so called because their master Zeno taught mainly in this place.

Other buildings which were indispensable for public business or ritual, and which, therefore, could not have been allowed to remain long in ruins, were the Buleuterium or Senate House, the Tholus, and the Prytaneum. The position of these has already been considered in Chapter III. There is no reason to suppose that they were spared by the Persians, and their rebuilding may be attributed with probability to the time of Cimon. Of the form of the Prytaneum we know nothing; it must have had accommodation for the service of the common table kept up for Athenians of distinction and for foreign ambassadors; this, however, had nothing of the luxury we usually associate with a civic banquet. It also held the sacred hearth of the state, and the statue of the goddess Hestia. Some of the functions which we might have expected to belong to the Prytaneum were assigned to the Tholus, which was situated close to the Senate House at the upper end of the Agora. The Tholus served as the official

residence of the chairman of the fifty Prytanes, during his twenty-four hours of office, and he and his colleagues, together with certain other officials, dined there at the public expense; one-third of the number, as well as the chairman, had to stay there all the time. The name implies that it was a circular building; its roof is said to have been of stone, not of wood; and it was also called, probably from the appearance of this roof, the Σκιὰς or parasol. It seems hardly probable that a building of this nature should have had sufficient accommodation for the purposes mentioned; we have no reason to suppose that the Greeks of the fifth century would or could have constructed a dome of any considerable size. Perhaps there were other chambers for living and sleeping attached to the circular structure which was the most essential part of the building and gave it its name. Certain rites, especially of libation and sacrifice, were connected with the Tholus; and in many Greek cities, as at Rome, we find such circular structures connected with a sacred hearth, usually the hearth of the state, and the deities that preside over it, Hestia or Vesta. We have seen that in Athens this hearth was in the Prytaneum. The duplication is not easy to explain; perhaps when the common Prytaneum and common Senate House for all Attica were established, the old hearth of the town of Athens alone was retained in the Tholus. The Senate House, or Buleuterium, was close to the Tholus. It may probably have had the shape of a small theatre; it was provided with

benches for the Prytanes or presidents, a platform for the speakers, and a railing to separate the part open to the public. In the same region were the statues of the Eponymous Heroes of the ten tribes; they must have been set up soon after the Persian War, for they are constantly referred to. It was the custom to affix various announcements, made according to tribes, to their pedestals — especially the lists of the names drawn for military service. We do not know by whom the statues were made, unless, as is possible, we are to recognise Myron's Erechtheus among them.

A shrine that we know to have been erected by Cimon is the Theseum; he brought the bones of the hero from Scyros, and prepared for them a temple which was decorated with paintings of which Pausanias gives us a description; these were by Micon, or, according to some authorities, by Polygnotus—a confusion we have already noticed in the case of the paintings in the Painted Portico. The paintings were probably frescoes which covered the three walls of the shrine, the fourth being occupied by the door of entrance; two of them represented the battles of the Athenians under Theseus against the Amazons, and of the Lapiths against the Centaurs; the subject of the third was an episode which is often represented by vase painters, among them Euphronios on a beautiful vase, and which is related in one of the recently found poems of Bacchylides. This was the visit of Theseus to Amphitrite below the sea, when he

accepted the challenge of Minos to prove his divine origin by undertaking to recover a ring thrown into the sea, and when Amphitrite gave him also the crown which he afterwards presented to Ariadne.¹ The Theseum, as we learn from Pausanias and from other indications, was somewhere to the east of the Agora; it cannot, therefore, be identified with the temple still extant, which is commonly known as the Theseum, rather because archæologists cannot agree on any other name for it than because any one now accepts this identification.² The *Ἀνάκειον*, or temple of the Dioscuri, of which we have already noticed the position near the precinct of Aglauros on the north slope of the Acropolis, was also decorated with paintings by Polygnotus and Micon, and so may be classed with the temples restored by Cimon. The paintings both represented exploits of the Dioscuri or events in which they were concerned. The subject of that by Polygnotus was "the marriage of the daughters of Leucippus"; that is to say, most probably, the scene in which they were carried off by Castor and Pollux in their chariots, as we often see them on vases and reliefs. The painting by Micon referred to the expedition of the Argonauts, and in it Acastus and his horses were

¹ Some writers suppose, because Pausanias goes on to speak of the end of Theseus, that this also was represented. This is most unlikely, especially as it is part of a story not very creditable to the hero. Pausanias' reason for mentioning it is evidently to explain how Theseus' bones came to be in Scyros, and has nothing to do with the paintings.

² See Chapter X., below.

the most prominent objects; it is, therefore, conjectured that the scene depicted must have been the funeral games he celebrated in honour of his father Pelias.

It would be possible to extend to a considerable length the catalogue of the buildings that were probably erected before the ostracism of Cimon, because, being indispensable to the civic life or the religious rites of the state, they must have been restored soon after their destruction by the Persians. But the few that have been mentioned are selected either because of their frequent mention by classical writers, or because of the artists who were employed in their decoration. For the dating of other buildings of the fifth and fourth centuries we are dependent to a great extent on the record of the artists whose works they contained. Inferences from this record are evidently liable to error; although a statue cannot well have been placed in a temple before the building was completed, it may have existed before, and have been transferred from elsewhere; and it may not have been placed in the temple until some time after its completion. Still, there is no harm in using this evidence as giving a probable indication, though not one that can be insisted on against other evidence or probability. There is only one building in the lower town of which the erection is attributed by direct evidence to the time of Pericles. This is the Odeum, which was said to have been built in imitation of the tent of Xerxes, and to have been constructed out of the masts and yards of captured

ships. It was mainly of wood, and to this fact it owed its destruction, for it was burnt when Sulla besieged Athens, though it was afterwards rebuilt.¹ It had seats for a considerable number of people, and many columns. It was most probably in the form of a small theatre with a roof. Its chief use was for the musical contests at the Panathenaic festival; but it was also used for the official rehearsal of plays to be performed at the Great Dionysia. The beauty of the building was noted; its external appearance may be to some extent inferred from the jest of Cratinus at "Pericles, the squill-headed Zeus, with the Odeum on his crown." Of course, one must not strain the interpretation of such a jest; but the comparison would have had no point at all unless the Odeum had a round or oval roof. The Odeum was situated close to the Theatre of Dionysus, just to the east of it. It was thus in a very convenient position, either for loungers or for assemblies, formal or informal. It was sometimes used for these purposes, and also for the storing and distribution of grain in times of scarcity. Unfortunately no traces of it can now be seen. Other buildings, or at least the statues they contained, must be assigned to the time of Pericles, and of Phidias as the general director of artistic activity. One of these was the temple of Aphrodite Urania; the cult of this goddess, who was recognised as identical with the oriental goddess of love and queen of heaven, was said to have been introduced by Ægeus; in its original form

¹ See p. 491.

it was associated with licentious rites such as made Corinth a byword; and it was contrasted with the more sober worship of Aphrodite Pandemos, the "great and holy"¹ goddess of marriage, whose ritual formed a recognised part of the state religion. There is no doubt, however, that in ancient as well as in modern times the relation of the two cults was all but inverted. Spenser's *Hymn of Heavenly Love*, as opposed to *Earthly or Natural Love*, simply follows the distinction of Urania and Pandemos as interpreted by Plato.² It is probable, when we consider the religious tendencies of Pericles and of Phidias, that the statue of Aphrodite Urania was inspired by the same conception, and was intended to give a new and higher meaning to the worship of the goddess. We do not, unfortunately, possess any certain copy of the statue to confirm or refute this theory.

Another statue attributed to Phidias, or by some to his favourite pupil Agoracritus, was that of the Mother of the Gods in the Metroum beside the Senate House. She was represented as seated, with a cymbal in her hand, and with lions seated beneath her throne, a type preserved on several reliefs. Here it would seem that the sculptor contented himself with reproducing the usual type of Rhea and the attributes of her cult. Another temple about contemporary with the Parthenon is that now generally called the Theseum; as this is

¹ Μεγάλη σεμνή Πάνδημ' Ἀφροδίτη. — Milchhöfer, xi. 87.

² In the *Phædrus*.

reserved for separate treatment, it is unnecessary here to discuss either its date or its identification.

After the banishment or death of Phidias, his predominant place among Attic artists seems to have been inherited by Alcamenes, to whom were entrusted the chief public commissions for sculpture down to the close of the fifth century. Some of the statues attributed to him may of course have been made before the beginning of the Peloponnesian War; but the majority of them are probably to be assigned to the last quarter of the century. He supplied the statues for several of the best-known temples of Athens—the “Aphrodite in the Gardens,” Ares in the temple near the Areopagus, Hecate on the tower (Ἐπιπυργιδία) on the bastion of Athena Nike, Hera in a temple between Athens and Phalerum, the colossal gold and ivory Dionysus in the temple below the Theatre, and a Hephæstus, probably to be identified with the colossal bronze statue set up together with another statue of Athena, as stated in an inscription of about 416 B.C.¹ These statues were probably those set up in the temple of Hephæstus, and the temple itself may be of the same date or a little earlier. The artistic types of all these statues have given rise to much conjecture and discussion, which cannot even be summarised here. It is probable enough that copies of some of them may be seen in statues of those various divinities that are still familiar to us. Their record suffices to show us that the Athenians found oppor-

¹ Reisch, *Jahreshefte*, I. p. 55, *CIA*. I. 318, 319.

tunity, during the intervals of the Peloponnesian War, not only to build the Erechtheum on the Acropolis, but also to add many new temples and statues to beautify the lower town. The disastrous conclusion of the war does not seem, so far as our information goes, to have left much mark on the buildings of the city; we have already noticed the destruction and rebuilding of the Long Walls. The last recorded work of Alcamenes was a group of Athena and Heracles, set up to commemorate the exploits of Thrasybulus and the freeing of the city from the Thirty Tyrants; it was however dedicated, not in Athens, but in Thebes, whence Thrasybulus had started to seize Phyle.

The earlier part of the fourth century does not offer any records of great importance to the architectural history of the city. Some improvements and alterations were made in the precinct south of the Acropolis, dedicated to Asclepius, whose worship had probably been introduced into Athens from Epidaurus during the Peloponnesian War to take the place of an earlier shrine of healing on the same spot. This, however, is more fully considered in the next chapter. Possibly many projects were begun, but none of them finished, until the able administration of Lycurgus, who managed the finances and other affairs in Athens from 338 to 326 B.C., brought more order into the department of public works. Foremost among these was the Theatre of Dionysus;¹ he also finished the construction of the Stadium, which

¹ See Chapter IX.


hitherto had probably been only roughly adapted to its purpose in a natural valley, and rebuilt the gymnasium of the Lyceum, the favourite resort of Aristotle and his pupils; and at the Piræus the architect Philo erected under his administration a splendid arsenal for the gear of the Athenian ships,—a building for which we still possess the specifications. None of these buildings, except the Theatre and the Stadium, has survived to our time; and the Stadium has been so much changed, first by the addition of marble seats by Herodes Atticus, and more recently by a modern restoration, that it is difficult to form any notion of it as it was in Lycurgus' time. But numerous inscriptions as well as literary records testify to the great services which he rendered to the state, not only in finance, but also in beautifying the city and completing what others had begun, and from the age of Pericles to that of Hadrian there was probably no other man who left so lasting an impression upon Athenian architecture.

If the public monuments of Athens are less conspicuous in the record of the fourth century than in that of the fifth, it is otherwise with private buildings and dedications. A most interesting class is that which is concerned with victories in the choric dances held in honour of Dionysus. A tripod was the prize given to the victorious choragus; and this was usually dedicated to the god, sometimes on the top of a little temple or shrine constructed for the purpose. A most beautiful example of these choragic monuments is the one dedicated by Lysi-

crates in 334 B.C. This is in the form of a small circular temple of the Corinthian order, of which it is one of the earliest and most beautiful examples. It is raised upon a high square basis, and the spaces between the columns are filled by carved marble panels, of which the upper part is decorated with tripods in relief. The whole building is most delicately ornamented; the roof, which is made of a single block of marble, is cut into a leaf pattern, and provided with supports, decorated with acanthus and volutes, to carry the legs and body of the tripod that surmounted the whole. The frieze, which is only about ten and a half inches high, has figures in relief, representing the adventure of Dionysus with the Tyrrhenian pirates, as narrated in the Homeric hymn. The offenders who had attacked the god when in disguise, were represented as undergoing punishment at the hands of his attendant satyrs. Some are already changed or half changed into dolphins; others are being chastised by satyrs with the rods that they are breaking from trees for the purpose; in the midst the god himself is seated, caressing his panther, while on either side of him sits a satyr with a thyrsus, looking on at the scene; and beyond these are great wine-bowls, and satyrs around them who give orders to those who are more actively employed, so that the god himself is widely separated from the scene of turmoil. The various groups correspond almost exactly with one another all through the relief, though there is in each case a slight variety of action, so that we have here another remarkable example



CHORAGIC MONUMENT OF LYSICRATES.



of the symmetry that usually belongs to Greek architectural sculpture.¹ The open spacing of the figures and groups is, as was to be expected, more like that of the Mausoleum frieze than the closer arrangement of the friezes of the fifth century in Athens, and the slimness of the proportions and a certain studied grace in the attitudes betrays the tendencies of the later Attic school.

The monument of Lysicrates stood in the Street of the Tripods, which was named after the structures of a similar nature that were set up there; one of them contained the famous satyr of Praxiteles, copies of which are probably to be recognised in extant statues.² The whole street was famous for the works of art which it contained, most of them, apparently, of the fourth century. There is some evidence that another similar building existed close to the monument of Lysicrates until the seventeenth century, and that the two were known from their shape as the Lantern of Demosthenes and the Lantern of Diogenes. The monument of Lysicrates was for a long time used as the library of a Capucin monastery; it was restored to its present condition by the French in 1845.

The most conspicuous of all the choragic monuments was that set up by Thrasyllus in 320 B.C. in the cave above the great Theatre. He walled up the front of the cave with an ornamental architectural front, and

¹ This symmetry is slightly obscured by the inversion of the order of two of the groups on Stuart's drawing and subsequent reproductions, including the restoration of the monument itself. See De Cou, *Am. Jour. Arch.* VIII. p. 42.

² See my *Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, Fig. 85.

set up above it the statue of Dionysus which was brought to England by Lord Elgin and is now in the British Museum; this, though a work of no special merit, is interesting as showing an attempt to revert to the monumental dignity of the sculpture of the Phidian age. Stuart's view shows this monument as it



CAVE ABOVE THEATRE.

Once faced with choragic monument of Thrasyllus.
Above it, columns to carry tripods.

was in his time.

It has now been in great measure destroyed; but an architrave with inscription still remains, showing that the original monument of Thrasyllus was supplemented by other dedications, probably tripods, added by his son about fifty years later. The cave

now contains a little shrine dedicated to *Παναγία Χρυσόσπηλαιώτισσα*, "Our Lady of the Golden Cave," and was in mediæval times a spot of considerable sanctity; but its worship and title have now been transferred to a modern church in the lower town, and the only trace of it that is left is the lamp that still burns in the shrine, and that, from its position, is curiously conspicuous at night.

Set on the rock above the cave are two columns with triangular capitals which once carried votive tripods.

Another choragic monument has had a curious fate; it was originally set up by a certain Nicias to commemorate a choric victory of 320 B.C., the same year as that of Thrasyllus. It has been suggested by Professor Dörp-



CHORAGIC MONUMENT OF THRASYLLUS ABOVE THEATRE IN TURKISH TIMES.

feld that it stood on a foundation that was partially destroyed when the Odeum of Herodes Atticus was built. But the architectural front of the monument has been used to make an ornamental gateway between the two towers at the foot of the approach to the Acropolis; and there it stands to the present day, with its inscription on its architrave. We have no certain evidence when it was placed in this position. If it was removed

when the Odeum was built, a natural inference is that it was then transferred to be the lower gate of the Acropolis; but it makes so cramped and awkward an entrance that one finds difficulty in believing that it was put there in the time of Hadrian. It would rather seem to date from some later repair. This is the gate which was excavated by Beulé, and which is often called, for that reason, the "Beulé Gate."

The contrast between the magnificence of the public buildings of Athens in the fifth century and the simplicity of private houses is pointed out by Demosthenes;¹ and he uses this contrast to point a moral at the inverted relation of the two in his own day. "The public buildings," says he, "they constructed for us, the number and the beauty of the temples, and of the offerings they contained, are such that their successors can never surpass them; but in private life they practised so great moderation, such conformity to political traditions, that even if any of you knew which was the house of Aristides or Miltiades or any of the famous men of old, you would find it no more pretentious than its neighbours. . . . And what can one point out nowadays? The battlements we make a fuss about and the roads we repair and the fountains and such rubbish? No; look at our statesmen; among whom those who were poor have become rich, and those who were unknown have come to honour, and some of them have built themselves private houses more pretentious than the public buildings."

¹ *Or.* III. 25.

This speech of Demosthenes was of course made before the administration of Lycurgus had removed the slur which he here casts upon the public undertakings of his time; and we have already noticed the lack of public buildings that can be assigned to the earlier or middle portions of the fourth century. We can trace the beginnings of a more sumptuous taste in domestic architecture back to the fifth century. Alcibiades is said to have kidnapped the painter Agatharchus, threatening to retain him a prisoner in his house until he had finished adorning it with frescoes; and it was three months before the unlucky painter made his escape, leaving his work still unfinished. Xenophon,¹ too, quotes Socrates as expressing his disapproval of this practice, and asserting that such decoration destroys more pleasure than it gives. And the house of Callias, as described in the beginning of Plato's *Protagoras*, must have been a conspicuous building, since it contained a court with extensive porticoes, in which various groups of talkers could walk or sit, and chambers for guests, and store-houses, in addition to the usual domestic accommodations. But the limited extent of the city and the crowding of its population must always have made such extensive houses the exception rather than the rule, save in the case of the suburbs and gardens and country houses which the richer Athenians already possessed in the time of Pericles, and which he urged them to give up without repining when the Spartan invasion drove

¹ *Mem.* III. 8.

them all within the walls of the town. Doubtless after the stress of the war had passed, the middle as well as the upper classes of the Athenians returned to their country houses with the same delight as is evinced by Trygæus in Aristophanes' *Peace*. It is not to be imagined, however, that even in the fourth century the finer houses of a Greek city had an imposing appearance like a modern mansion; they usually showed blank walls to the street, or had mere slits for windows; they were, as a rule, except their foundations, built only of sun-dried brick covered with stucco, such as offered insufficient defence against the *τοιχωρύχος*, the wall-digger or burglar of ancient times; and they usually had no external architectural ornament beyond a simple porch, with small columns to support it, at the front door. The roof, too, was usually flat; and though some of the houses in a town were two-storied, they probably had no very imposing proportions from without, however sumptuous were their arrangements and decoration within. We must therefore imagine the town of Athens, in the fourth no less than in the fifth century, as distinguished only by its open spaces, religious or civil, Agora and precincts, public buildings, and temples of the gods. The streets mostly kept their old size and direction, and were, according to our notions, mean and narrow, and the private houses afford little variety of aspect. On the other hand, the public gardens and gymnasia, and other places of resort for leisurely conversation or pleasant walks in the suburbs, had greatly

improved. The impression one gathers from the literature of the time is not only of a city unrivalled for the monuments of its art, but of one pleasant to visit or to dwell in, surrounded by a country diversified with trickling streams and shady groves. And with them was associated what is now lost with them, the temperate climate celebrated by Attic writers.

CHAPTER X

THE THESEUM, THE ASCLEPIEUM, AND THE THEATRE


THE temple generally known as the Theseum¹ is in a better state of preservation than any other that has survived from Greek times ; and, moreover, it is one of the most conspicuous buildings in Athens outside the Acropolis. Yet its name and identification have been the subject of almost endless controversy, and the temple itself is for some reason disappointing in the impression it produces on the visitor to Athens. This impression, which is very widely felt, must have some reason. We should have expected the almost complete preservation of a temple, built in Athens and contemporary with the Parthenon, to have been an immense help to our imagination in realising what Greek architecture was like in its best examples. That this is not the case, at least to as high a degree as might be expected, is not due entirely to the position of the Theseum. It is situated on a low hill, just clear of the modern town, while the whole space between it and the Acropolis is left open ; and it is consequently possible to obtain a view of it from various positions, in which its effect is not marred

¹ The most recent and complete work on the Theseum is that of Professor Sauer. See also Baumeister, art. "Theseion."



THESEUM AND NORTH SIDE OF ACROPOLIS.

The enclosures and entablature built into the Acropolis wall are visible above the left end of the Theseum and above its pediment.



by the vicinity of modern structures. The explanation must probably lie in the fact that the Theseum, though built in the best days of Attic architecture, was not designed by an architect like Ictinus or Mnesicles; it has no simple and easily appreciable relation between its various proportions, such as in the Parthenon gives satisfaction to the eye; and a Doric building depends almost entirely for its effect on these subtly harmonised proportions.

The history of the Theseum is similar to that of other temples in Athens; it owes its preservation to being transformed into a church, in this instance dedicated to St. George; and it has escaped the disastrous accidents that ruined the Erechtheum and the Parthenon. Like the Parthenon, it had to be supplied with a new roof; but this was done without so much damage to the structure. The question of the identification of the building is better deferred until we have before us the data supplied by its architectural forms and sculptural decoration.

The Theseum is a temple of the Doric order, with six columns at front and back and thirteen at each side. It is raised upon three steps, of which the upper two only are of marble, the bottom one of Piraic limestone; if this bottom step was visible, the result must have been unsatisfactory in appearance. The plan of the body of the temple is a common one for Greek temples; it consists only of a cella, with a pronaos in front, and an opisthodomus at the back which is a mere recess;

there is no second chamber, as in the Parthenon. At front and back, within the colonnade, the temple ends in two columns between antæ. The roof of the colonnade is to a great extent preserved, and consists of sets of panels or caskets carried by marble beams which run across from the entablature above the columns to the top of the cella wall. In this as in other respects the Theseum gives us a notion of the appearance of a Doric temple when complete. The slabs closing the caskets at the top are in many cases loose, and provided with letters to indicate their position. It has been suggested with probability by Mr. W. N. Bates that they could be removed and replaced at will, so as to admit into the cella the light reflected up from the pavement outside — an ingenious solution of the problem of lighting a Greek temple.¹ The forms of the echinus of the capitals and of other details resemble those of the Parthenon pretty closely, and it is impossible to draw any chronological distinction between the two buildings, or to suppose that they were separated from each other by any long interval of time.

The Theseum has preserved to a remarkable degree the traces of the colours with which it was originally painted; there is some conflict of evidence as to details, especially such as, if they once existed, have disappeared within the last half-century or so. It seems fairly clear, however, that, here as elsewhere, the broader masses such as columns and architraves were left plain, and that the

¹ *Amer. Jour. Arch.* 1901, p. 37.



THE THESEUM FROM THE WEST, SHOWING FRIEZE IN SITU.
Lapiths and Centaurs. Cæneus group in centre.

colouring was confined either to the smaller mouldings or to such surfaces as were subdivided in detail. Thus the triglyphs were blue, and the mutules also, while the drops projecting from the latter were red, and red was also used for other small surfaces. The background of the metopes, too, was red, while that of the continuous frieze over the inner columns was blue. And in many cases where the colour is lost the various weatherings of the surface show the leaf pattern and other designs that once ornamented the mouldings. A much-disputed question is whether any such pattern ever existed on the echinus of the capital; but the balance of evidence, as well as of probability, appears to favour the opinion that the echinus was left plain.

The sculpture of the Theseum consisted of pedimental groups now entirely lost, metopes placed over the Doric colonnade on the outside, and also a continuous frieze set above the inner columns and antæ within the colonnade at each end, a position similar to that of the continuous frieze of the Parthenon; but this frieze is not, in the Theseum, continued along the sides of the building as well. The metopes are not all sculptured, but only those of the east front, ten in number, and the four on each side adjoining the east front. These metopes have all suffered greatly from the weather, and many of them are barely distinguishable at present; they were a little better preserved in the time of Stuart, and, consequently, his drawings are of considerable value in any attempt at reconstruction.¹ The ten metopes of the east front represent the labours of Heracles, and the other eight, on the sides, represent the exploits of Theseus. Although so little is left, the scenes and the actions correspond so closely with the treatment of the same subjects on Attic vases that it has been possible to recover almost completely the original compositions; and this has been done with great ingenuity, and also with a high degree of certainty, by Professor Sauer in his monograph on the temple. This, however, is too much a question of Greek mythography to be included here; it must suffice for us to note that nine of the usual labours are represented on the ten metopes, that of Geryon being divided between

¹ *Antiquities of Athens*, III. 1. See also the drawings in *Mon. Inst.* X. 43-44, 58, 59. Sauer, *op. cit.*

two. There is nothing incongruous in this, since Hercules is represented as an archer; but it is a clear survival of tradition, for on the Athenian treasury at Delphi the subject of Geryon and his cattle occupies no less than five metopes. The exploits of Theseus are also a favourite subject upon Attic vases; and here, too, the groups on the metopes correspond very closely with the representations on the vases. This close correspondence is the more remarkable



METOPÉ OF THESEUM.
Theseus and Cerberus.

since, in the case of the almost contemporary metopes of the Parthenon, it has not been found possible, to any great extent, to identify their subjects, or to restore them, by the help of vase-paintings; one may fairly draw the inference that the sculptors of the Parthenon metopes were either more independent of tradition altogether, or at least that they did not follow the tradition common to the sculptors of the Theseum metopes and the Attic vase painters. The Theseum metopes have, however, qualities of their own which go beyond this common tradition. The subjects and motives are selected with considerable skill to suit their architectural frame, the

principle followed being almost always that of contrast. The lithe and athletic bodies of the heroes and their vigorous action show out well against the rigid squares in which they are set. But, on the other hand, the action is often too momentary, the position too unstable, to be suited to sculpture. We noticed these characteristics in a certain class of the metopes of the Parthenon, though hardly in so extreme a form as in the Theseum. So far as we can judge from the damaged surface of the sculpture, supplemented by the obser-



METOPE OF THESEUM.
Theseus and bull.

vation of earlier travellers, the style of the modelling would also appear to be of the same dry and sinewy kind that we noticed in the Parthenon metopes. At the same time, the composition and execution show certain differences as well

as this general resemblance; in particular, the sculptor, or sculptors, of this particular set of Parthenon metopes seems to be more original in his choice of motives, less content with the conventional repertoire. If we agree with the commonly accepted notion that the influence or school of Myron is to be recog-

nised in the Parthenon metopes, we shall be inclined to attribute the metopes of the Theseum to a similar, but not to the same, school, and to a school more closely bound up with the earlier Attic traditions. Such a school may be that recorded to have been founded by Critius, who joined with Nesiotes to make the statues of the Tyrannicides; but we must remember that any such conjecture, though affording a convenient name, must not be regarded as an established fact.

The continuous friezes of the Theseum were not identical in their arrangement. That at the west end, which contained scenes from the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs, extended only over the front of the temple itself, between the antæ and above the columns. That at the east end not only covered this space, but also extended in the same line, on each side, across the colonnade; and the distribution of the groups it contains takes these architectural conditions into account. Above each of the antæ is a comparatively quiet group of seated gods; outside these, at each end, are groups of captors with prisoners; while the middle space is taken up by a wild scene of battle, in which the combatants, on one side at least, appear to hurl huge stones as their weapons, while their antagonists are armed as Greek warriors. A probable explanation of the scene appears to be that Greeks, probably Athenians, are here represented as fighting some gigantic or barbarous foes; the suggestion of O. Müller is that these are the Pallan-

tids, fifty gigantic sons of Pallas, who disputed the kingdom of Attica with Theseus. Though many other suggestions have since been made, no other seems to fit the circumstances so completely; for in the midst is one heroic figure who bears the brunt of the combat, and may well be Theseus himself; even if the temple is not the Theseum, there is no doubt that his deeds are represented in some of the metopes, and so he might well appear on the frieze also.

The battle between the Lapiths and Centaurs, which is the subject of the inner or continuous frieze at the west end of the temple, is of a simpler composition. Its extent, as we have already noticed, is limited to the space above the antæ and columns. In the midst is a great group, familiar on vase-paintings, of which the central figure is the invulnerable Cæneus. He is buried to the waist in the stones that the Centaurs are piling on him, but he still protects himself with sword and shield; and on either side another Greek comes to his aid. In the rest of the frieze there is a distinct tendency for the composition to break up into pairs of combatants, each of which would fit into the square frame of a metope; and some of these groups have a strong resemblance to certain metopes of the Parthenon. This resemblance has given rise to much discussion, some authorities maintaining that the Theseum frieze is directly copied from the Parthenon metopes, while others think the resemblance may be sufficiently explained by a common tradition; the subject, being a suitable one for

metopes, may have become stereotyped into a series of groups with a limited number of motives. The truth probably lies between the two extreme views. The Theseum frieze shows considerable difference in style from the metopes of the Parthenon, and cannot be a work of the same school, or directly dependent on them. Moreover, there are other cases besides that of Cæneus where the groups are too extensive to be derived from metopes; and the west frieze of the Theseum, as well as the east, shows some bold examples of foreshortening and other pictorial devices which are foreign to the character of the Parthenon, and show more affinity with painting. At the same time, it must be admitted that a set of compositions as bold and vigorous as the metopes of the Parthenon was likely to influence an almost contemporary work dealing with the same subject, and the resemblances that have been pointed out are too close to be attributed to mere coincidence. If we allow for the difference of architectural conditions, the friezes and metopes of the Theseum do not, so far as we can judge, show anything like the difference in style which we see between frieze and metopes in the Parthenon. The temple, being a small one, was probably more quickly completed, and with less variety in the sculptors employed to decorate it.

The pedimental sculpture of the Theseum has left traces on the bed of the pediments similar to that which we have noticed in the case of the Parthenon. These traces have been recorded and studied in both instances

with the same care by Professor Sauer. In the case of the Parthenon his investigations have, as we have seen, led to valuable results. There, however, they were supplemented by classical references to the subject of the pediments, by extant remains of the sculpture, and by drawings made by earlier travellers when the groups were in better condition. In the case of the Theseum no such aids exist; and apart from them it might well be doubted whether any satisfactory inferences could be drawn from the mere traces of weathering and other indications left on the building. Professor Sauer, however, has not despaired; from the available evidence he has inferred, not only the number and disposition, but also to some extent the position and character of the figures represented. He has then, with the help of reliefs and vase-paintings, devised a subject for the east pediment—the birth of Erichthonius from the Earth, who hands him over to the care of Athena in the presence of Hephæstus and Cecrops—which can be reconciled with the extant indications.¹ Here, however, while we cannot but admire the ingenuity with which Professor Sauer has supported his theory, it cannot seriously be maintained that he has done more than give a possible solution of the problem. Another archæologist, possessed of equal knowledge and acumen, could probably suggest another solution which would fit equally well the marks on the ground of the pediment;

¹ Professor Sauer also proposes a restoration of the west pediment; but it is less satisfactory in itself and based on less evidence.

and, in any case, so highly conjectural a restoration is not admissible as evidence for the identification of the temple.

It is a curious chance that has left the identification of the best-preserved of all Greek temples, a temple, too, in a conspicuous position in the town of Athens, in a state of uncertainty; for, although several identifications have been proposed with a considerable degree of confidence, and have met with some acceptance, none of them can yet be said to have obtained any general consensus of opinion in its favour. It is, therefore, still customary to call the building by the name "Theseum," although hardly any authorities now accept that identification;¹ even Professor Sauer, who has decided views on the subject, retains "Theseum" in the title of his book.

The data for identification are, briefly, as follows: The building is clearly a temple; and, as it faced east, it was presumably dedicated to a god, not to a hero.² It may be dated, both from its architectural forms and from the style of its sculptures, as almost exactly contemporary with the Parthenon. The subjects of its sculptures are, in the metopes, the exploits of Heracles and Theseus; in the friezes, a combat with some gigantic or savage enemy who cannot be identified with certainty, and the battle of the Greeks and Centaurs;

¹ The only notable exception, I believe, is Mr. Penrose, who bases his belief mainly on the orientation, which fits his theory.

² This rule that a heroum faces west seems to be usually observed, though clear instances are rare; the temple of the Dioscuri at Naucratis faces west.

in the pediments, groups which have completely disappeared. It is situated on a low hill just to the west of the Agora, probably to be identified as *Colonos Agoraios*, in the quarter of Melite; Pausanias mentions two or three temples in this neighbourhood, and others are recorded by various writers. The suggestions as to the identification that have met with most acceptance are that it is the Theseum, the temple of Hephæstus, the temple of Apollo Patrous, or the temple of Heracles in Melite, not to include other guesses that are topographically or otherwise inadmissible.

Of these the identification of the building as the Theseum is excluded both by the date of the building—for Cimon brought the bones of Theseus from Scyros in 469 B.C.—and by its position; for Pausanias mentions the Theseum among other buildings which we know to have lain to the east of the Agora. Its general acceptance in earlier times is due simply to the representation of the exploits of Theseus on the metopes. The assignment of the temple to Apollo Patrous, also, is inadmissible topographically, since that temple was in the Agora, not above it to the west; and, moreover, there is nothing appropriate to this in the sculptures. The temple of Hephæstus is, topographically, the most suitable; for Pausanias describes that temple as above the Stoa Basileios, and this can hardly mean anything but on the little hill where the Theseum stands; this identification was advocated by Dr. Lolling, is supported by Professor Dörpfeld, and is provisionally ac-

cepted by Mr. Frazer, after a careful summary of all the evidence. Whether we accept it or not will mainly depend on the weight we assign to the subject of the extant sculptures in metopes and friezes; for whatever interpretation we may give to them, it is not easy to bring them into any relation with Hephæstus. This is frankly admitted on all hands; but it is suggested that the subjects of metopes and friezes, being of subordinate importance, need not necessarily have any relation to the deity to whom the temple is dedicated; and the temple of Zeus at Olympia and the Parthenon itself are quoted to prove this statement. They do not, however, offer an exact parallel. The relation of Heracles to Zeus, especially at Olympia, where, according to one account, he instituted the games, makes his labours an appropriate subject for his father's temple; and on the Parthenon, the subjects of the metopes, both in themselves and in their allegorical interpretation, were by no means indifferent to Athena; nor can miscellaneous sets of metopes, like those of Selinus, be quoted in this connection, for the sculptures of the Theseum are evidently all part of a common design. And even if we leave out uncertain subjects, there is nothing in the story of the Centaurs and Lapiths that can be considered at all appropriate to Hephæstus, while to carve exploits of Heracles and Theseus upon his temple would be a very doubtful compliment to him. It seems wiser not to accept as certain an identification that involves such an improbability, upon the

somewhat uncertain evidence of a topographical inference.

There remains the theory of Curtius and others that the "Theseum" is the temple of Heracles in Melite. The topographical evidence is not against this, though not very strong in its favour, since Melite was an extensive region. The fact that Pausanias has omitted all reference to this temple, if it was so conspicuous and so near to his route, may require some explanation. But we must remember that he only gives us a selection from his notes. And perhaps the conspicuousness of the temple at the present day leads us to an unwarranted assumption that it was equally conspicuous in ancient times. The great majority of the temples mentioned by Pausanias—not to speak of those which he omits—have disappeared without leaving any trace behind them; when they were all standing, many of them probably larger and richer in works of art than the "Theseum," it may have been easy enough for a traveller to overlook a building that the fortunate chance of Christian use has caused to survive its fellows. It would, however, be rash to assert that a temple was dedicated to Heracles merely because he appears on its metopes. If, then, we infer that the identification of the "Theseum" as the temple of Heracles in Melite is perhaps the most probable among the attempts that have been made to give it a place among the temples recorded in Athens, this opinion must be qualified by the reservation that it is quite possible no classical

writer has happened to refer to this temple or to record its name. Such a conclusion may seem unsatisfactory, but it is better than the assertion of certainty where certainty is unattainable on the evidence before us.

In the Asclepieum below the Acropolis, though little is preserved but the foundation, the identification of the site is not doubtful, and its arrangements are easy to trace. We have already noticed¹ that there existed in early Athens, to the west of the Theatre, and just below the rock of the Acropolis, a sacred spring and precinct probably dedicated to some deity of healing. The position is well adapted for the purpose, on a terrace below the south wall of the Acropolis, where it was sheltered from the cold winds, and where the rock caught and retained the full heat of the sun. For the invalids went there mostly in the evening, to stay the night in the building assigned to them. The worship of Asclepius seems to have been introduced into Athens from Epidaurus sometime during the Peloponnesian War, and to have found a home in this precinct.

The plan of the buildings which it contains shows considerable resemblance to that of the precinct of the god at Epidaurus; it is doubtless partly traditional, partly dictated by the necessities of the healing cult. It includes propylæa, or a gate of entrance; a cistern to hold the water for the preliminary purification outside the

¹ p. 98, above.

precinct; a temple¹ and altar for the god; a portico or gallery for the patients to sleep in; and, probably as a survival from earlier times, a pit of sacrifice and a sacred well or spring. We have already noticed the sacred spring and its early precinct; in later times the little cave that contained it was entered by a door in the back of the portico. The pit of sacrifice, built of early polygonal masonry, was also retained at the back of the west end of the portico and on a higher level; it was covered by an architectural canopy supported upon four columns, of which the bases, in black Eleusinian stone, still remain *in situ*—a structure analogous, though much simpler in design, to the famous Tholus of Polyclitus, or, as it is officially called, the Thymele, at Epidaurus. Of the temple and the altar the foundations only remain; they were on a small scale, and probably had nothing peculiar about their design. But the characteristic feature of the precinct is the portico in which the invalids slept. This backs against the rock of the Acropolis. Its front, for about a quarter of its length, was an open colonnade; in the remaining part there was a wall between the columns, and traces of a staircase imply that there was also a second floor.² At the east end, where it abuts on the great supporting wall


¹ Or possibly two temples; the repair of an "old temple" is mentioned in an inscription of Roman date, *CIA*. II. i. Add. 4890.

² As this is erroneously given on many plans, it is well to notice that there was originally a column on every third block of the stylobate, and a short wall, ending in an anta, at each end. There were sixteen columns between the antæ; the closed part began at the twelfth column, reckoning from the east to the west end.



ASCLEPIEUM FROM THE WEST.

Portico on left, below Acropolis rock; temple in front of it. Supporting walls of Theatre behind.



of the Theatre, there is a narrow space partitioned off from the rest of the portico, and the dado of marble, which stretches along the back, is not continued beyond this partition. There is a similar partition at the end of the Abaton or portico in which the patients slept at Epidaurus, and the purpose in both cases was probably the same — perhaps to form a den for the sacred snakes, which were let loose at night to wander among the invalids sleeping in the portico. We have in the *Plutus* of Aristophanes a description of an invalid's visit to the god, which is most instructive in its relation to the extant remains; for, although the narrative is relieved by comic touches, there is no doubt that it gives, on the whole, a truthful description of what usually took place. The slave, Karion, relates how he and his master took the blind Plutus to consult Asclepius. First of all, they led him to the Thalatta, the lustral spring or cistern, which we can still trace just outside the western boundary of the precinct, and there performed the proper ablutions. Then they entered the precinct of the god, and offered cakes and other oblations on the altar; they put Plutus to bed in due form, and many others were there, suffering from divers diseases. The attendant of the god came and put out the lights, and bade them sleep, telling them if they heard any noise to keep silence. So they all lay quiet. But the slave, who kept awake, saw the priest going round gathering the cakes and other offerings from the holy table and other altars. After this the god himself appeared, accompanied by

his daughters, Iaso and Panacea, and went round all the cases in due order; a boy attended him with a pestle and mortar and a box of simples. When he came to an unworthy suppliant, he put on him a stinging plaster that made him worse than before; but when Plutus' turn came, the god sat down beside him and touched his head, and then took a clean napkin and wiped his eyes. Panacea covered his head and face with a purple cloth; then the god whistled, and two gigantic snakes came from the temple, and crept under the purple cloth and seemed to lick his eyes. Then immediately Plutus rose up with his sight restored, and the god and his snakes disappeared into the temple. And all the invalids who were sleeping in the place gathered round to congratulate Plutus, and kept awake until day dawned.

The close correspondence between this passage of Aris-
tophanes and the official records of the cures at Epi-
daurus¹ shows that the poet is following pretty closely
the actual customs of the ritual of Asclepius, though it
is possible he may be, intentionally or unintentionally,
confusing two types of cure which seem to be distinct in
the official lists — the therapeutic or surgical, and the
miraculous or "faith-healing." The regular formula at
Epidaurus is "so and so, suffering from such and such a
complaint, came and slept in the Abaton and saw a dream
or vision. The god or a snake came and touched the
part affected, and, when day dawned, he went out whole."
There are numerous varieties of detail: sometimes, for

¹ See Cavvadias, *Epidauræ*; also 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1883, pp. 199; 1885, pp. 1, 199.

instance, it is a dog that effects the cure; sometimes the patient is expressly said to be awake, not sleeping; and sometimes, as in the *Plutus*, an unworthy applicant is punished for his presumption in approaching the god. But two or three things seem to be clear. In the first place, there were a certain number of genuine "miraculous" cures, just as there are at the present day, probably for the most part in nervous diseases or hysterical cases, at the festival of Tenos, which presents many analogies with the ancient cult of Asclepius. There one may see, at the present day, on the feast of the Annunciation, the invalids duly put to bed in the church and in the crypt below it; and almost every year there are instances of visions seen in the night, of instantaneous cures of apparently hopeless cases, and of crowds flocking to congratulate the subject of the miracle. The similarity in this last detail is most interesting, since it shows how, in modern as in ancient times, the many who were not cured could forget their disappointment in the rejoicing over the one successful case. It may be that the visions were assisted by the presence of actual snakes, let loose for the purpose, and even by the priests' impersonation of Asclepius and his attendants — a deception by no means difficult in the darkness and in the atmosphere of faith. But there is little doubt that the priests of Asclepius in many places acquired also, by tradition and experience, considerable skill in medicine and surgery. The physician Hippocrates was a member of the priestly family of the Asclepiadæ of Cos.

The Asclepieum, as was only to be expected, was very rich in votive offerings. Inventories of these have survived, as well as a certain number of the offerings themselves; one of the poems of Herondas, describing a visit to the Asclepieum at Cos, shows how such a shrine could develop into a museum of works of art. While the Athenian precinct may have had no such exceptional richness, it certainly was a place where people commonly resorted to view the offerings; else it would not have occurred to the *Μικροφιλότιμος* of Theophrastus to make a display of polishing a worthless ring he had dedicated there. In earlier times a customary offering for a grateful patient was an image of the god himself, most frequently a relief, in which he was represented as attended by his sons and daughters, often by Iaso and Panacea; and the worshipper and his family, usually on a smaller scale, often approach him with suitable offerings. The representation of the "banquet of a hero," which is common on tombstones,¹ is often used in the same way for Asclepius, with the addition of worshippers on a smaller scale. Another very common form of offering, especially in later times, was a relief with a representation of the part of the body that had been cured, or to which the god's attention was requested — a pair of eyes or ears or breasts, a hand or a leg. Probably such offerings were often made in precious metals on a small scale, like the similar objects, cut out of silver plate, which may be seen attached to the sacred pictures in many Greek churches

¹ See p. 471, below.

at the present day. Such representations were not usually of the nature of pathological models — though some examples to the contrary are known; as a rule the dedication showed the limb or member in its normal healthy state, and so offended neither against good taste nor against religious propriety.


The Theatre of Dionysus is situated just to the east of the Asclepieum; the topmost part of its curve is actually scarped out of the rock of the Acropolis, having in the midst of it the little cave faced with the choragic monument of Thrasyllus.¹ It slopes down to the precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus, where there already existed, at least from the time of Pisistratus, if not earlier, the small temple and primitive dancing-place of which we have already noticed the remains.² We do not know the exact date at which the performance of plays was transferred from the early orchestra in the Agora to the site of the Great Theatre; but it is probable that most of the plays of the great Attic dramatists were first performed on the site that the tradition of ancient as well as of modern times associated with them. As soon as the drama had attained the popularity which we know it possessed at Athens in the fifth century, the performances cannot well have been held except in a place where the slope of the ground enabled a large audience to assemble and to have a good view of the actors and chorus. A temporary scaffolding, such as appears to have been used at first, would no longer suffice; and so recourse

¹ See pp. 403-404, above.


² See p. 122, above.

would be had to the slope of the south side of the Acropolis above the old dancing-place. It is possible that a tradition of the change is preserved in the story that in 499 B.C., when Æschylus was, perhaps for the first time, competing for the prize of tragedy, the wooden structure supporting the benches of the spectators gave way, during the performance of a play by Pratinas, and that in consequence a permanent theatre was built, to avoid such accidents for the future. This story has often been quoted as evidence for the age of the present stone theatre; but there are many indications, both in the materials and in the technique of the construction, which show that so early a date is impossible. The later limit of date is fixed by a decree in honour of Lycurgus, which mentions the Theatre of Dionysus among the buildings which Lycurgus completed, having found them in an unfinished state. This last statement has given rise to a considerable variety of interpretation; while, on the one hand, it clearly shows that the Theatre in its present state¹ cannot date from the beginning of the fifth century, it shows equally clearly, on the other hand, that the general design of the Theatre must belong to an earlier age than that of Lycurgus. Beyond this, there is really not much to be inferred from the inscription; it certainly does not justify the conclusion that the Theatre, as we now see it, belongs essentially to the time of Lycurgus. We are, therefore, obliged to rely on architectural evidence for the

¹ This means, of course, apart from later changes and modifications, as to which all authorities are practically agreed.



THE THEATRE FROM THE EAST.
Above, on the left, Museum Hill and monument of Philopappus.



date, both of the auditorium and of the earliest stage buildings. With these we may conveniently associate the later temple, since we have, in its case, external evidence available as to its date.


There are the remains of two successive temples of Dionysus in the precinct below the Theatre. The earlier and smaller of these belongs, in all probability, to the time of Pisistratus. The later was built to contain the gold and ivory statue of the god by Alcámenes. This latter building is of considerable importance to the technical history of architecture in Athens. Its foundations only are preserved, but these are of conglomerate or breccia, and probably show the earliest occurrence of this material in a building that can be at least approximately dated. The artistic activity of Alcámenes lasts from the age of Phidias to the end of the fifth century; but it is very improbable that the Athenians would have been able, during the latter part of the Peloponnesian War or the few years that followed it, to dedicate a statue of such expensive materials, and on a colossal scale. On the other hand, none of the buildings of the Periclean age show any use of breccia for foundations. The temple of Dionysus must, therefore, in all probability, belong to some time between the Peace of Nicias in 421 B.C. and the start of the disastrous Sicilian expedition in 415 B.C.¹ And, if so, there is no reason for deny-


¹ Professor Dörpfeld, *Gr. Theater*, p. 22, suggests a later date, early in the fourth century; but this is not easy to reconcile with the probable dates of the career of Alcámenes.


ing that the stone theatre also may have been begun about the same time.

If we accept this as the most probable conclusion, — and it must be remembered that, while the extant Theatre may be later, it cannot well be earlier than the date just suggested, — it follows that all the plays of Æschylus, the majority of those of Sophocles and Euripides, and the earlier ones of Aristophanes, were all performed in an earlier structure, of which nothing is left except, perhaps, the circle of the orchestra and some traces of foundation in the western parodos.¹ The extant remains are deprived by this fact of a considerable part of their interest, both from the archæological and from the purely sentimental point of view. The arrangements for the performances of the Attic drama in its greatest days remain to a great extent a matter of inference or conjecture. It seems probable, however, that even then the natural slope of the hill was supplemented, at least on the wings, by artificial substructures. The old circle of the orchestra may still have remained in use, and on the side away from the hill a temporary booth, or scena, may have been erected when required. The front of this had already received some architectural form and decoration, to make it suitable to serve as the palace front already conventionally adopted as the usual tragic background; whether or not there was any platform or stage erected in front of it for the actors to mount upon is a question of which the

¹ Marked "foundations of passage" in plan,







100-443887-100

answer depends on the whole issue of the controversy as to whether there was or was not a raised stage in the Greek theatre—a controversy which it is impossible even to summarise here, though a few words more must be said about it after we have considered the extant remains of stage buildings in the Theatre of Dionysus. Whether we are investigating the auditorium or the stage buildings of this Theatre, we must always remember that it originated in a natural hillside sloping down to an old dancing-place, that it was only gradually adapted by artificial improvements to its later purpose, and that it served as the prototype from which all other ancient theatres were more or less directly imitated. It would therefore be superfluous, at least in the case of the earlier buildings, to look for either regularity of plan or for conformity to the rules about the construction and proportions of theatres that were deduced by later theoretical architects from a study of extant examples. In the case of the auditorium the irregularity of shape is most marked. The orchestra is, it is true, of one of the normal forms—a semicircle prolonged by tangents on each wing; but the great retaining wall has a shape which is evidently dictated by no consideration except the necessity of getting seats for as many people as possible into the available space. At the top the rock of the Acropolis is scarped in an irregular curve, and at the bottom of the scarp are some seats cut in the solid rock. On the west side the curve of the scarp is continued round for some distance, and then the extreme

wing is continued by a straight line running out at an angle from the end of the curve;¹ on the east side, which is not so well preserved, the shape appears to have been even more irregular. The massive retaining walls are built of a core of breccia, faced on the outside with a casing of Piraic limestone. The auditorium seems to have been divided into an upper and lower portion by a road which ran round it, following the curve of the seats. This road emerged by the passage still visible just to the south of the Asclepieum, and served the purpose that was fulfilled by the diazoma in other theatres. In the upper part of the theatre the seats have now almost entirely disappeared, and so it is impossible to judge either of their appearance or of the



ATHENIAN COIN.

View of Theatre, with
caves above it, and
Acropolis.

acoustic properties of the building; those who wish to judge of either of these must go to Epidaurus, where the theatre built by Polyclitus is not only harmonious and beautiful in its lines to a degree that must be seen to be appreciated, but so admirably adapted to its purpose that a conversation in an ordinary voice can be heard with ease over a space that would contain about seventeen thousand people. The theatre at Athens is larger; Plato's estimate of thirty thousand is probably only meant for a rough approximation, but it has been

¹ Into this south-west corner is built a stone with an inscription which has been quoted as evidence of date; but the forms of the letters are so abnormal as to give no certain indication. They could well be earlier than any date to which the Theatre can be assigned with probability.

calculated that it could have seated at least twenty thousand people. Though its acoustic properties have suffered considerably from the loss of the intermediate seats, they are still good; and it cannot be supposed that the democratic audiences of Athens would have tolerated any performance which was not audible throughout the building.

The seats are divided, at least in the lower part, into thirteen wedges, separated by twelve staircases, the steps of the staircases being sloped, so that only one step is required for each tier of seats. The ordinary seats are made of single blocks, the surface of each being divided into three parts: the front, slightly raised to form the seat itself; the middle, sunk to offer space for the feet of the spectator in the seat above; and the back part, serving as a support to the next seat behind. The seats are also divided transversely, by cuts in their front surface, so as to define the space allowed for each spectator; this is only about thirteen inches. It seems at first sight a very small allowance;¹ but we must remember that in the open air crowding would be less intolerable; and that, when there was only a single performance of each play, and consequently everybody who wished to see it must attend that

¹ Cf. Schultz, *Megalopolis*, p. 42: "As this allowance of 13 inches per person seems at first sight so absurdly small, I have made inquiries with regard to the minimum space usually calculated for each person in a modern London theatre. I am informed that, although the minimum space per person, recognised by the County Council, is 18 inches, as a matter of practice, theatre managers find that, in the pit and gallery, where the seats have no dividing arms, people can be got to occupy as small a space as 14 inches per person, and that 16 inches is a good allowance."

one performance, it was necessary to put up with some discomfort in order to enable as many as possible to be present. We know that the Athenians in other matters, such as the length or continuity of the performances, were capable of enduring what would seem intolerable even to the most enthusiastic audiences of the present day.

The lowest row of seats consisted of thrones, not continuous benches, as at Epidaurus, Megalopolis, and elsewhere, but separate seats, like solid marble chairs, placed side by side, sometimes two or three carved out of a single block. Here there was no lack of space or dignity. All have the graceful curve of back and legs with which we are familiar in the wooden chairs represented on Greek vases of the best period. The central throne of the central block not only has arms as well as back, but is ornamented with carving in low relief. Below



MIDDLE BLOCK OF FRONT SEATS IN THE
THEATRE.

the seat, in front, are conventional groups of Gryphons fighting with Arimaspi; on the back are Satyrs in the attitude of supporting figures, treated with a slight touch of archaism that suits their decorative purpose. But

the most beautiful piece of work is on the outside of the arms. Here we see on each side a most graceful winged Eros, kneeling to set a cock to fight; the relief is of the most admirably delicate execution and design,

and it is impossible to assign it to a later date than the fourth century. We may safely infer that these thrones, if they were not already there before the time of Lycurgus, were part of the work contributed by him to the completion of the theatre.

In front of the thrones is a broad gangway, sloping gently toward the orchestra, and serving to give access not only to the thrones themselves but also to the staircases that led up between them. This gangway is, on its inner edge, raised one step above the orchestra level; and against this edge has been fixed, in Roman times, a row of vertical slabs, with the marks of a metal grating fixed above them; these slabs have no relation to the legitimate use of the Theatre, but were placed there to give protection to the audience at the performance of gladiatorial or other shows, and, according to some authorities, to contain also the water with which the orchestra could be flooded on occasion, to serve for mimic sea-fights and other aquatic displays. We must then imagine the slabs as absent in an attempt to realise the appearance of the Theatre as it was in the fourth century. Without them, the effect is much more spacious and dignified. Between the gangway and the orchestra runs a deep channel, such as is always necessary in theatres to carry off the water that falls within an uncovered building of so extensive an area; it is emptied by means of a drain that runs beneath the scena to the south-east. The channel is bridged over by slabs that gave access to the foot of the various staircases; spaces were left at



THEATRE AND OLYMPIEUM FROM ACROPOLIS.

The foundations of the various stages are visible.

intervals between these slabs to admit the water. The slabs with perforated drain holes in them that now serve the same purpose are of Roman date, probably contemporary with the paving of the orchestra in blue and white marble. The orchestra of Greek times consisted prob-



ably, like that at Epidaurus, merely of hardened earth. A small altar may have been placed at the same time as the pavement in the centre of the orchestra, but the conventional opinion that the thymele always occupied this position in Greek theatres rests on no satisfactory evidence. The earthen floor of the orchestra was probably on a level with the sill that borders the surrounding channel. But this sill was not continued, as at Epidaurus, so as to form a complete circle; indeed, the shape of the lowest tier of seats at Athens would be ill adapted to such an arrangement.

The stage buildings in the Theatre are far from easy to trace on the spot. The published plans of the building give a fairly accurate notion of what may now be seen, but, in order to be intelligible, they require to be supplemented by a more detailed plan of the earliest extant scena, as shown by excavations that are now filled in again, and as restored by architectural inferences. The extant remains of this scena consist only of its foundations, constructed of breccia; these take the form of a long rectangular hall, with a square projection into each parodos opposite the border of the orchestra; this hall backs against a long stoa, constructed of similar material, as far as its foundations are concerned. In the middle of its back wall is a very massive projecting block of masonry. The foundations of the wall facing the orchestra (20) and of the projecting wings (22) are very wide — wider than is necessary to carry an ordinary wall or a row of small columns, such as those still standing in

the Theatre. As to the restoration of the building resting on these foundations, there are two main theories: the one, that of Professor Dörpfeld,¹ asserting that no stage need be assumed, and that we need only look for a background for actors on the level of the orchestra; the other, recently advocated with much ingenuity by Professor Puchstein,² assuming that a stage is probable, and accordingly regarding the restoration of the first floor of the building, not of that on a level with the orchestra, as the essential matter. The two alternative restorations given in the plan will suffice to make clear the points at issue. But before we can discuss them we must notice another portion of the extant structures that is brought into this connection by Professor Dörpfeld. This is a narrow stylobate of Hymettus marble, with traces of columns upon it, and with the shafts of some columns still standing. This stylobate is shown in the general plan of the Theatre (23 and 21), where it now exists, about ten feet in front of the breccia foundations of the scena, where they face the orchestra, and continued in a slightly projecting wing on each side, above the projecting wing of the breccia foundation, but well within its front. The stylobate corresponds pretty closely in position and plan to the similar stylobate at Epidaurus, and there is practically no dispute as to the restoration of the structure that rested upon it—a column-fronted proscenium, such as has been found in almost all later Greek theatres, and of the proportions prescribed by

¹ *Das griechische Theater.*

² *Die griechische Bühne.*



Vitruvius. Even this question, however, is not so simple as it appears at first sight; for the stylobate has, in addition to the traces of the columns that stood upon it as now fitted together, traces of another set of columns differently spaced; and Professor Dörpfeld has shown that, according to the earlier intercolumniation, it is possible to restore the original arrangement of the slabs of the stylobate in such a manner as to make them fit exactly on to the front portion of the broad breccia foundation facing the orchestra, and also to make them run out at both sides over the projecting wings of this breccia foundation. The columns, according to this arrangement, are not evenly spaced, but have broader intercolumniations opposite the three doors in the wall, which Professor Dörpfeld restores as standing on the back part of the breccia foundation in its central portion. On the wings he restores the columns as standing out free.

Two very obvious objections raised by Professor Puchstein against this restoration are that it is unlikely that the foundation would have been made so broad on the wings if it had been originally intended to carry only this narrow stylobate, and that the effect of columns standing close to a wall in the middle,¹ and standing free on the wings, would be very awkward; he also points out that the exact fitting of the stylo-

¹ Professor Puchstein goes so far as to say that columns set immediately in front of a wall are unknown to Greek architecture of good period. But such general statements are always hazardous, since they may any day be upset by a new discovery.

bate to the foundation is a less convincing piece of evidence than it appears, since a considerable margin for error is allowed by the breadth of the foundation. These technical points will probably weigh less with most of us than more general considerations as to the probabilities of the case, and the analogy of other theatres. Wherever elsewhere we find a proscenium faced with low columns, it stands far enough out from the wall of the scena to enable a platform some ten feet wide to rest on the top of it; and it therefore seems improbable that at Athens the prototype of all theatres should have had its proscenium differently constructed, though similar in appearance from the front. Such a form would be more suitable for an imitation of a conventional arrangement. However, those who are convinced that Professor Dörpfeld is right in denying altogether the existence of a stage in the normal Greek theatre, and in asserting that the column-front proscenium of later times was used as a background for actors in the orchestra, not as a platform for them to stand upon, will do well to accept also his restoration of the earliest permanent stage buildings at Athens. Those, on the other hand, who think the evidence clear that the proscenium, about twelve feet high and ten feet wide, which exists in most Greek theatres, was used as a platform or stage for the actors to stand on, will naturally look for something analogous at Athens. And there is no difficulty in restoring the earliest extant stage building at Athens

according to their views. The space between the projecting wings of the foundation would serve very conveniently for the erection of a temporary wooden platform, such as is probable as the predecessor of the later stone proscenium, and such as is implied by the foundations of a wooden structure found at Megalopolis,¹ at Sicyon, at Segesta, and elsewhere. A probable form for such a stage is suggested in Professor Puchstein's restoration; it would be entered, not only from the back, by the usual three doors, but also by side doors from the projecting wings or parascenia. If this view be correct in the main, it will follow that the proscenium with marble columns is not contemporary with the breccia foundations of the earliest stage buildings, but is of somewhat later origin. It has also been shifted from the position where it was at first placed, and has had its blocks and the columns upon it rearranged.

We are now in a position to realise the chronological results of the architectural and other evidence, and of the various theories that are based upon it. Professor Dörpfeld regards the whole of the earliest extant scena, foundation, stylobate, and columns alike, as belonging to one time, and that the time of Lycurgus, the stylobate and columns having merely been shifted at a later date. According to this view, we have no monumental evi-

¹ My own previous view of a low wooden proscenium, as suggested at Megalopolis, I do not now think probable, in view of the analogy of other theatres. It seems more likely that the wooden proscenium at Megalopolis was of the usual height, ten feet or so, and that a temporary scena was erected behind it.

dence earlier than about 338 B.C. as to the structure of the Theatre, and must depend, for the greater part of the fourth as well as for the fifth century, entirely on inferences from extant plays and from probability or from later tradition. We have, however, seen that the evidence does not compel us to adopt so extreme a view. Lycurgus only finished what others had begun, and there seems to be no insuperable difficulty in assigning the main plan of the extant buildings to about the same time as the later temple of Dionysus — perhaps as early as 420 B.C. If this be the case, then we have actually some remains of the stage on which the plays of Sophocles, and Euripides, and Aristophanes were first produced. What remains from so early a date can, however, be nothing but the foundation of the stage building; the superstructure was probably a temporary erection of wood, and we can only recover its nature by probable conjecture. The stone proscenium which was later substituted for the wooden one may be the work of Lycurgus, but its shifting into its present position most probably belongs to a later age; its original position may probably enough have been nearer to the lines of its wooden predecessor.

The last few pages have necessarily been concerned with controversial matters. The divergent theories as to the existence or the absence of a stage platform in the Greek theatre are now so familiar to scholars and even to the general reader that they cannot be ignored; yet it is impossible here to give an adequate summary of the arguments that have been adduced on either side.

All that can be done is to note that each opinion is held by many scholars whose authority is entitled to respect; accordingly the evidence offered by the extant remains of the Theatre of Dionysus has been stated in its relation to each theory respectively; the interpretation that each reader will prefer will depend mainly on his views on the larger question. At the same time, it is only fair to state my own opinion that the use of the raised proscenium or *λογεῖον* as a stage for the actors is established by very clear evidence in the case of the later Greek



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

RELIEF FROM THEATRE.

Dancing girl.

theatre, and this analogy would lead one to expect some such platform in the Greek theatre of earlier times also.

The changes of the Theatre in later times, though they have led to considerable modifications in its appearance, are neither so puzzling to the investigator nor so fruitful of controversy as those of earlier date. Among the various stage decorations, the graceful figures of

dancing girls probably belong to a good Greek period, rather than to a Roman imitation of Attic work. The Theatre seems to have remained much as it was, but for the shifting of the stone proscenium, until Roman times. There remain various architectural fragments, consisting of arcades, pillars faced with semicolumns, and supporting figures of Satyrs and Sileni which appear to belong to a decorated scena; and one of these has an inscription referring to Nero. The emperor's visit to Athens may probably have been the occasion of its erection; to the same time may in all probability be assigned the sculptured frieze still visible in the orchestra; and, if this frieze was originally placed as in the later structure that now contains it, on the front of the stage facing the orchestra, the stage must have been of Roman, not of Greek type, and have consisted of a broad, low platform. Another trace of this same stage may probably be recognised in the row of blocks of Piraic limestone that are set close against the breccia foundation of the front of the scena; they were probably placed there in order to make the foundation broad enough to carry the scena of Roman times, with its projecting architectural decorations.

Further changes were introduced in the time of Hadrian, but mainly, so far as we can tell, in the auditorium. Statues of the emperor were set up in each of the wedges of seats, and a small platform to carry his throne was erected in the central wedge.

The latest stage, and the most conspicuous one at the

present day, was constructed by an archon named Phædrus, probably sometime in the third century A.D.; his inscription is rudely carved on the top step of the short stair that leads from the orchestra to the top of the platform. The relief facing this stage, which is too well executed to belong to such an age, and has been mutilated to fit it to its present use, was probably prepared, as has been said above, for the stage of Nero's time; it represents on one panel the birth of Dionysus, who is held by Hermes in front of his father, Zeus; on another a rustic sacrifice



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

RELIEF FROM THEATRE.

Dancing girl.

to the god; and on the third a subject of doubtful interpretation, but probably allegorical.

Behind the scena is a great portico, facing the precinct below; it is clearly a part of the same design as the scena, and is probably contemporary with it; its foundations also are of breccia. The stylobate and columns and the facing of the back of the portico were of bluish

Hymettus marble, a material frequently used in the fourth century, though hardly at all in the fifth. This portico may well have been one of the things finished by Lycurgus; not being necessary for the performance of plays, it might well be left to the last. It doubtless served the purpose assigned by Vitruvius to porticoes near a theatre, to give shelter to the audience in case of a sudden shower; the same purpose would be served also by the adjoining Stoa of Eumenes, when it was built.

The Theatre was not used only for dramatic performances. So convenient a place of assembly, when ready for use, soon came to supersede the Pnyx as a place for the meetings of the Ecclesia, or general body of citizens; and *ἐν Διονύσειον* or *ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ* is sometimes added to the preamble of decrees in the fourth century and later. At first perhaps, as in recorded instances, these assemblies were to deal with matters concerning the state worship of Dionysus, but other matters of public interest soon came to be included; thus the crown given to Demosthenes, the subject of the two famous speeches of the orator and of his rival Æschines, was ordered to be presented to him in the Theatre at the time of the Great Dionysia.

The precinct below the Theatre as well as the Theatre itself were thus places of resort, both at the Dionysiac festivals and at other times, and so became a favourite place for setting up the statues, not only of famous dramatic poets, but also of many poetasters, whose fame seemed even to the Greeks themselves inadequate

to justify such an honour. It is probable that the statues which we possess of Sophocles, Euripides, and Menander are derived from the statues set up in the Theatre, though Pausanias himself remarks that the portrait of Æschylus was not a contemporary one.



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

SCULPTURED FRIEZE, SUPPORTING LATER STAGE IN THEATRE.

In fact, Lycurgus proposed the erection of statues to Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides in the Theatre. There were also in the Theatre statues of Miltiades and Themistocles, each with a Persian captive beside him. The most important works of art recorded by Pausanias in the precinct, besides the colossal gold and ivory statue of the god by Alcamenes, consist of a series of pictures, probably frescoes, in the temple, and probably contemporary with it. The subjects of these were the return of Hephæstus to Olympus by the help of Dionysus, the punishment of Pentheus and Lycurgus for their violence to the god, and Dionysus approaching

Ariadne after her desertion by Theseus,—all of them favourite subjects on vases or other works of ancient art.

The small and ancient temple still continued to stand beside the later one, as is proved by the fact that the corner of the great portico behind the Theatre is cut away to fit into its steps. It contained the early wooden statue of Dionysus Eleuthereus, which was annually carried in solemn procession to the Academy.

CHAPTER XI

*THE CERAMICUS*¹

τιθέασιν οὖν ἐς τὸ δημόσιον σῆμα, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τοῦ καλλίστου προαστείου τῆς πόλεως, καὶ αἰεὶ ἐν αὐτῷ θάπτουσι τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων, πλὴν γε τοὺς ἐν Μαραθῶνι. ἐκείνων δὲ διαπρεπὴ τὴν ἀρετὴν κρίναντες αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν τάφον ἐποίησαν.

— Thuc. II. 34. 3.

ὁ κεραμεικὸς δέξεται νῶ.
δημόσια γὰρ ἵνα ταφῶμεν,
φήσομεν πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγοὺς
μαχομένῳ τοῖς πολεμίοισιν
ἀποθανεῖν ἐν Ὀρνεαῖς.


— Ar. Av. 395-399.

THE Ceramicus was the chief though not the only burial-place of ancient Athens; but its name is so familiar to us in this connection, both from ancient literature and from modern impressions of the town, that it may be taken as typical of a Greek cemetery. The term "Ceramicus" had indeed no such exclusive application in ancient times. It was the old potters' field that provided the clay for the unrivalled Athenian vases; and it was divided into the inner Ceramicus, which in later times came to be synonymous with the Agora, and the outer Ceramicus, the most beautiful suburb of the city, stretching along the roads to the Academy and Eleusis.

¹ For a fuller treatment of the whole subject, see P. Gardner, *Sculptured Tombs of Hellas*, and Conze, *Die attischen Grabreliefs*.

From quite early times it was used for burial, as is sufficiently attested by the fact that the great majority of the Dipylon vases come from its tombs. But graves of this early period, as well as of that which succeeded, are found in considerable numbers elsewhere in Attica; and burial even within the city itself appears not to have been prohibited until the time of Solon. For the most part, the graves that are scattered over the surface of Attica appear in groups. Often they are in low mounds or tumuli; when such a tumulus is investigated, it sometimes proves to cover a small group of tombs, each with a built structure originally showing above ground. Then the principal tomb of the whole set seems to have been made beside these, and the tumulus heaped up over it; and, finally, many other graves, of various later periods, were made in the tumulus. We are, however, at present mainly concerned with the tombs immediately around Athens. These, as in the case of other Greek cities, seem to have been placed chiefly along the most frequented roads leading out of the town, so as to attract the attention of wayfarers; they naturally were thickest just outside the various gates, though, in the case of the most popular road of all, the Sacred Way to Eleusis, the foundations of many tombs may still be seen even on the ascent to the pass of Daphne. In many cases the tombs of families were grouped together; thus Miltiades, Cimon, and Thucydides were all buried just outside the Melitid gates — not, probably, where the rock-cut tomb is now shown

near the church of St. Demetrius Lombardaris, but farther north between the Pnyx and the Observatory. Others were buried in appropriate spots; thus Plato's tomb was near the Academy, and Themistocles' grave was at the entrance of the Great Harbour of the Piræus, of which he had been the first to develop the opportunities. "Thy tomb," as Plato, the comic poet, says of him, "set in a fitting spot, shall be spoken by all the merchants as they pass; it shall see them sailing out and in, and shall be a spectator whenever there is a ship-race." On the road from the Piræus to Athens were the tombs, among others, of Socrates, of Euripides, and of Menander. But, as was to be expected, it was above all outside the Dipylon Gate, in the Ceramicus, that famous names impressed the visitor to Athens in ancient times. Here were the tombs of all those who had fallen in war, and had received a public funeral; the very names of the campaigns in which they fell was a record of the glory of Athens or of its vicissitudes; only Marathon retained the bones of its heroes in its sacred soil. In the Ceramicus were the tombs of Solon and Clisthenes, of Pericles and Lycurgus, of Phormio and Thrasybulus, and Conon, and Chabrias, and many others who had guided the Athenian state in prosperity or saved it in peril. In fact the mock-heroic boast of Peithetærus, in the battle with the birds, "the Ceramicus shall receive us," is evidently the Athenian equivalent of "Victory or Westminster Abbey." Not that the Ceramicus was exclusively reserved for those who had



fallen in war or distinguished themselves in peace. Though it has yielded the great majority of the tombstones that have survived to our times, few if any of them can be identified among those seen by Pausanias or mentioned by other writers; an example that might be quoted is a plain slab, surmounted by a band of ornaments, and containing the names of the knights who fell at Corinth in 394 B.C., among them the young Dexileos, whose beautiful private monument is still standing above his tomb. But the monument to those who fell at Corinth, seen by Pausanias, was probably to the larger number of infantry who fell in the same campaign. The Ceramicus was, indeed, crowded with graves of all periods and classes, often three deep, and only a small portion of its cemetery has been excavated. While therefore we cannot, like Pausanias, gratify our sentiment by contemplating the actual tombs of the heroes of Athenian history, we can, on the other hand, observe a great number of monuments that record the feeling or beliefs of the ordinary Athenian in the presence of death or bereavement, and the manner in which he recalled to memory his departed relatives or friends.

The form of the monuments is usually very simple. We have already noticed that in earlier times it was often a mound, perhaps with a retaining wall around it, and sometimes surmounted by a funeral vase.¹ Down to the fifth and fourth centuries this form seem to have persisted; but the stela, vase, or other monument, instead

¹ See p. 456.

of being placed on the top of the mound, was more often set on a base immediately in front of it; and, when graves were much crowded together, the mound came either to be greatly curtailed or to disappear entirely. The monumental earthen vases, set up outside the tomb in early times, continued in occasional use at least in the fifth century; but now frequently marble substitutes were provided, either in the form of the great two-handled "lutrophoros," with its symbolical reference to the unmarried,¹ or the lecythus, which properly belonged to the inside of the tomb, but often appeared outside it also. Both lutrophoros and lecythus often have sculptured upon them, in low relief, scenes which cannot be distinguished in character from those on ordinary stelæ.



MARBLE LUTROPHOROS AND LECYTHI ON
RELIEF.

Boy with hoop and departure of a knight.

The usual form of the tombstone in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries is the stela, or upright slab; in its simplest form it is merely a flat slab of marble, rather narrower at the top than at the bottom, usually crowned

¹ See p. 173.

with a palmette or acanthus ornament. Sometimes it has two rosettes carved on it side by side,¹ and above or below them is incised the name of the deceased, usually in beautifully formed and regular letters. Below the name a panel of ornamentation comes to be added, sometimes in painting, sometimes in low relief; the subjects fall under a limited number of types, which must be described later. The panel in relief grows until, in the best-known form of Attic tombstone, it becomes the chief part of the monument. To the usual ornament at the top there is added, especially when high relief is used, an architectural frame at the sides also, and this frame sometimes takes the form of pilasters or semi-columns; thus we have developed the type of a shrine or miniature temple, within the front of which the figures of the relief seem to stand. Though this is probably the actual course of development, it is not to be supposed that any inferences as to date can be drawn from the various forms. The simple ones persisted side by side with the more elaborate, and all alike were prevalent throughout the period, from the latter part of the fifth century to the end of the fourth, to which nearly all the sepulchral stelæ of Athens must be ascribed.

Attempts were frequently made in Athens to restrict not only the ostentation of mourning at funerals but

¹ The origin of these is doubtful. Some have suggested that it is anthropomorphic, and that they represent the breasts of a human figure; but proof of this is lacking, and it does not seem very probable.

also the sumptuousness of funeral monuments. Demetrius of Phalerum, who controlled the affairs of Athens from 317 to 307 B.C.,¹ took a special interest in the matter and wrote a treatise about it, which is quoted by Cicero.² Solon, he says, though he made regulations to restrain mourning, enacted nothing about tombs, except to prohibit their violation; but soon after his time, to prevent the sumptuousness of tombs such as may be seen in the Ceramicus, it was enacted that "no tomb should be built with more elaboration than could be effected by ten men in three days." At the same time it was prohibited for tombs to be ornamented with stucco or for portrait busts to be set up over them; and these regulations, so far as we can judge, were, in part at least, observed throughout the finest period, though the regulation as to the amount of labour to be expended was apparently evaded by buying the stelæ or other monuments ready made in a sculptor's shop. Demetrius himself passed much more stringent rules; he ordered that no monument should be set up except a simple mound of earth with a column not more than three cubits high, or a flat slab, or a vessel for water. We find, accordingly, that from his time to the Roman age sepulchral monuments of any artistic value or interest are practically unknown at Athens. For this reason, too, the sculptured sarcophagi, the most characteristic tomb of later times, are not found at Athens, except in a few exceptional examples of the Roman age.

¹ See p. 481.

² *De legibus*, II. 26.

The great majority of the sculptured tombs that have been found in Athens were probably bought ready made. Occasionally a well-known sculptor was employed, as in the case of the horses and riders made by Praxiteles and mentioned by Pausanias; but these were the exception. The ordinary Attic tombstones, as we may now see them in the Ceramicus or in the National Museum at Athens, were a commercial product, made by men who had no claim to be more than artisans; and we must remember this fact in criticising them. Their artistic quality of workmanship does not often rise beyond a certain facility and mediocrity, and, with a few notable exceptions, we may look in vain to them for any high quality of technique. For this reason it is all the more noteworthy that they seldom fail to produce, on any who come to them with an unprejudiced mind, a satisfying impression. They evidently have behind them an artistic tradition and instinct that avoids what is false or theatrical, and chooses what is fitting for sculptural treatment. But, above all, this fact attests the feeling of restraint and moderation that characterised, not only the sculptors, but also the Athenian public for which they worked; for we have here, not the works of art designed to satisfy the criticism of a Pericles or a Phidias, but the product demanded by the ordinary Athenian citizen.

The identification of the figures of a group is not always obvious, and sometimes it is not easy to say which represents the deceased; in some cases, indeed,

the group seems to serve for the commemoration of a whole family, and in that case it may be more or less of an accident over whom it was first set up. Portraits, as such, are extremely rare; indeed, the prohibition of portrait busts shows probably what the general feeling was about the matter. The figures are all of them typical, not individual. There was therefore no occasion for the custom, sometimes suggested, of leaving the heads in the rough, to be finished after an order had been given. There are no certain examples of such a practice, though some unfinished grave reliefs or figures have been found; but, on the other hand, there are some instances in which an extra figure seems to have been cut into the side or background of a relief to suit the requirements of a customer. Such examples do not, however, invalidate the statement that the sculptured tombstones were as a rule made to meet a general need, rather than the requirements of particular cases. We need not, therefore, be surprised to find that they fall into a few clearly marked classes, according to the subject chosen and the way it is treated.

We find, in the first place, a large number of reliefs in which the deceased—for such we must presume the figure to be—is employed in the ordinary pursuits of daily life. Thus a child has his playthings and pet animals, a hoop or a bird; a young man carries his oil flask and strigil, and is often represented in the performance of some athletic exercise, or in preparation for it; or a youth and even a man

of mature age may be represented with his favourite animals—dog or hare or bird. A lady is frequently represented among her children or at her toilet, or play-



MONUMENT OF HEGESO.

ing with the jewels in her casket, often with the help of a slave or attendant. In all these cases the immediate intention of the artist is evidently to represent

the deceased just as he was in life, and enjoying those things in which, when alive, he had delighted. There is no need to look for any subtle allusion to a continuation of the same pursuits beyond the tomb; except, indeed, for the suggestion that the survivors like to have their absent friend presented to their imagination still the same as he was when he was with them. It is but a slight extension of the same notion when the allusion is not to the general tenor of life, but to some conspicuous moment in it — it may be to the crowning exploit that ended in death. Thus it is not uncommon for one who had fallen in battle to be represented in full armour, whether at rest or in action; the finest example is the monument



TOMB RELIEF.
Young man with boy and animals.

of Dexileos, one of the knights whose name is recorded on the stela already mentioned, set up to the memory of those who fell at Corinth in 394 B.C. His own monument states that he was one of the Five Knights; he is represented on horseback transfixing with his spear a prostrate foe. This relief must have been specially prepared for a special occasion; but there is no reason to suppose that it represents any particular exploit of

Dexileos, rather than a type of chivalrous and victorious youth.

In all this class of monuments we see no allusion, not even a covert one, to death; in the rest there is



MONUMENT OF DEXILEOS.

at least a symbolical and sometimes a direct reference to it. The next class consists of groups, sometimes of only two figures, sometimes of a whole family; and the central motive of these groups is usually supplied by two figures that clasp hands, one seated and one

standing, or occasionally both standing. The clasping of hands was a more serious and unusual thing with the Greeks than it is with us; it was used in the ratification of an oath, in a solemn greeting, but above all in the parting before a long absence. Thus Agamemnon, before the sacrifice of his daughter Iphigenia, bidding her a longer and sadder farewell than she yet suspects, bids her part from him

*πικρὸν φίλημα δοῦσα δεξιάν τ' ἐμοί,
μέλλουσα δαρὸν πατρὸς ἀποικήσειν χρόνον.*

This must be the meaning of the clasping of hands upon the tombstones, and it is usually accompanied by a certain air of sadness, both in expression and gesture, that fits the occasion. At the same time there is no hint of anything like mourning, either real or conventional, except, perhaps, in the resting the head on the hand in a common attitude of sorrow. The gentle and restrained pathos of the scene is suited rather to the fictitious parting on the relief than to what it signifies. When we remember that the Greeks, and especially the women, were by no



TOMB RELIEF.

Family group — parting scene.

means naturally given to such restraint over the expression of their grief, and that legislation was frequently necessary to keep it within bounds, we must recognise either that the art of sculpture imposed even on the common people a respect for its conditions, or that



TOMB RELIEF.

Old man, young athlete, and slave boy.

there was a strong feeling, possibly supported by legislation, against any unseemly representation on tomb reliefs.¹ However this may be, the sculptors have certainly observed the spirit as well as the letter of the restriction. A slight modification in the symbolism, though little change in the grouping or artistic effect, is introduced when the scene

of parting is more distinctly characterised by the addition of indications that one of the party is about to start on a journey. Thus, in one relief, a slave is putting on the sandals of a lady who is evidently on the point of departure; in another, a youth, who is bidding farewell to an older man, stands beside his

¹ An almost solitary exception is offered by a relief which represents a lady as falling back in death on a couch, surrounded by mourning relatives. (P. Gardner, *op. cit.* Fig. 66.) It is noteworthy that the family is of Plataea, not of Athens.

horse, ready to mount him and ride away. This meaning is evidently present to the mind of the artist, even if, as we shall see later, the horse is present for another reason also.

Mourning figures, as distinct from such as have merely some vague expression of grief, are, as we have noticed, usually absent from these groups. There are, however, a few exceptions, especially in subordinate figures: the little slave boy, for example, who sits huddled up at his master's feet, upon a stela that has some other peculiarities. The principal figure, an athlete of splendid proportions, leans against a tombstone, and both he and the older man who stands opposite him have an intense expression of sadness that shows the scene is one of parting, though the characteristic gesture of the clasping of hands is absent. The sculptor of this group has evidently fallen under the influence of Scopas, the great master of the expression of emotion, though his execution in detail is hardly on a level with his artistic aspirations. Such representations of the tomb on a tomb-



TOMB RELIEF.

Young warrior seated on prow of ship.

stone are not common ; they occur much more frequently on the funeral lecythi, which have a similar range of subjects. Another example of a figure in an attitude of dejection clearly represents the deceased himself. It is a curiously simple piece of low relief in two planes: we see the dead youth seated on the prow of a ship, which shows clearly enough that he was lost at sea; beside him his shield and helmet show that he was not probably a sailor, but on military service, whether as *ἐπιβάτης* or passenger. Mourning figures, usually female, are commoner as free statues set up over the tomb; they are usually represented as seated on a rock or on the ground, often with the head resting on the hand. Similar figures occur also in the gable-shaped ends of the famous sarcophagus of the mourners from Sidon,¹ which derives its subjects from the Attic sculptured tombs. A similar relief has also been found in Athens itself, from the metope of a more elaborate sculptured monument.²

So far the representations we have noticed, whether they allude to the departure of the deceased, or only to the events or habits of his life, contain no clear reference to any belief as to a life beyond the grave, or as to any customs connected with that belief. This is the case with the great majority of Attic tombstones of the best period. There is, however, another class of monuments, common outside Athens, and occasionally found in Athens too, especially in later times, which clearly repre-

¹ P. Gardner, *Sculptured Tombs*, Fig. 82.

² Wolters, *Mith. Ath.* XVIII. Pl. I.



By permission of Messrs. A. W. Mansell & Sons.

TOMB RELIEF.

Deceased as hero at a banquet; his wife seated beside couch, attendant and worshipper or descendant. Below table, dog.

sent the deceased as a hero in the technical sense — that is to say, as continuing to exist with superhuman power, and requiring or demanding gifts and offerings from his descendants. We find a reflection of this belief in the figures with offerings which frequently appear on the lecythi; representations of the deceased in heroised form, seated on a throne and approached by worshippers, are practically unknown at Athens, though sometimes, on tombstones of Roman date, we see him standing, usually beside a horse, and receiving a drink-offering. The only representation of the type which we find on Athenian reliefs in good period is that known as the funeral ban-

quet or banquet of a hero. In this the deceased is seen reclining on a couch, his wife often seated at his feet, while attendants bring him food and drink. At first sight one might be inclined to suggest that here we have again only a scene from ordinary life, representing the social pleasures of the table, just as others represented the employments of the gymnasium, of the toilet, or of family life. But a comparison with similar reliefs dedicated to Asclepius, himself a hero rather than a god, and the presence in those reliefs of attendants who are clearly worshippers bringing offerings, not merely servants waiting at their master's table, shows that the type is a religious one. Like the enthroned figures of Sparta and elsewhere, it must represent the deceased as in enjoyment of the offerings, often in kind, which his descendants bring to his tomb; it probably serves both as a monumental record of such offerings, and as a symbolical substitute for them.

It is unusual to find on the sculptured tombs any more definite or direct allusion than this to the life after death. The customary beliefs as to Charon and the voyage to the land of Hades have left little trace. Only in one tomb, of late date, we see a boatman, who may be Charon, approaching a group of figures arranged at a funeral banquet. The confusion of thought here implied is no greater than we constantly find on the lecythi; but the subject is so unusual that the interpretation has sometimes been doubted and another meaning sought for the boat in this scene.

Some special symbols are of common occurrence, and have given rise to much discussion. The snake is familiar enough in connection with tombs, but only occurs exceptionally in Athenian tomb reliefs. Figures that were often set up over tombs were sphinxes and sirens, both of them probably recognised as symbols of the mysterious Genius of death, terrible as the riddles of the one and the songs of the other. It is not so easy to explain the custom of setting up images of animals on tombs; a bull and a hound are among the most conspicuous objects in the Ceramicus at the present day, and they were not isolated of their kind. Animals were sometimes used as a sort of punning or "chanting" device on a monument—for example, the lion in relief on the tombstone of Leon,¹ or the tongueless lioness on the Acropolis, said to have been set up to commemorate the heroism of Leæna, the associate of Harmodius and Aristogiton, who refused, under torture, to betray her friends. The bull may have had some similar meaning; the dog may probably be interpreted as a watchful guardian of the tomb, as well as his master's favourite, though it is possible he may have had some symbolical meaning, since he appears on the hero reliefs, and is associated with the snake in the worship of Asclepius. Many theories have been held about the horse upon tombstones. He not only appears as part of the subject, but sometimes a horse's head in a square frame is inserted in a corner of a relief in such

¹ P. Gardner, *op. cit.* Fig. 50.

a manner as to suggest that it has some recognised and symbolical significance. It has been suggested, for example, that the horse is introduced as the symbol of a journey or expedition, and this may be the case where his rider stands ready to mount him. But Dexileos, for example, evidently appears with a horse because



MARBLE
LUTROPHORUS
WITH RELIEF.
Parting scene.

he fought on horseback as a knight; and the most generally accepted opinion now seems to be that the horse usually appears on tombstones as a symbol of the rank of the deceased, as in the example quoted by Aristotle¹ of a man who rose to the rank of knight-hood and set up an image of a horse to commemorate the fact.

The marble vases, whether lecythi or lutrophori, that stood over tombs, often have reliefs sculptured upon them that are similar in character to those on the stelæ, and belong to almost all the classes that have been enumerated; but the earthen lecythi, the vases that were painted for the dead, and either buried in the grave or placed on the monument, often fixed into sockets made to receive them, have a somewhat different range of subjects, mostly also of funereal significance. It is instructive to notice both how far these correspond with the subjects on the sculptured

¹ *Constitution of Athens*, cap. 7.

tombs, and how far they differ from them in treatment as well as subject. These lecythi, with outline or polychrome designs on a white ground, form a class by themselves, and appear to have been exclusively intended for funereal purposes. Some short account of them is desirable here, not only because they explain and supplement the tombstones, but also because they are a most characteristic product of Attic art, and one that can best be studied in Athens. For the immense number that has been found both in Athens itself and at Eretria, which seems for some reason to have been a fashionable burying-place, has filled the Athenian National Museum with an unrivalled collection of these beautiful vases.

We find, in the first place, a frequent occurrence of scenes from ordinary life; the subjects, indeed, are often not to be distinguished from those on other vases, and may sometimes have no special significance. But we have already seen on the stelæ how common is the representation of the athlete or the hunter at his favourite employment, or of ladies at their toilet or occupied with their jewels; and it is natural enough to give the same interpretation on the lecythus, and to recognise in these pictures typical representations of the life of the deceased. The other classes of subjects that are common in sculptured reliefs are seldom, if ever, found on the lecythi, which have, on the other hand, a different repertoire of their own in their allusions to death, and this includes subjects of three different kinds—actual or ideal repre-

sentations of the funeral, of subsequent visits to the tomb, and of the journey to Hades. From the funeral two scenes are commonly selected: the lying in state of the deceased on a bed or bier, among mourning relatives, who do not always show in their grief the restraint which we see on the reliefs; and the deposition in the grave, — sometimes represented as it actually happened, but more often in an ideal scene, where two winged genii, Sleep and Death, lay in the grave a figure of the deceased with none of the stiffness of death, but seated or recumbent as if asleep. The tomb itself often appears in the background. The representation of the visit to the tomb is again, in some respects, like what actually happened: the relatives of the deceased, especially women, bring sashes and wreaths and other offerings in broad, flat baskets to decorate the tomb; but often the deceased himself appears, a figure quite like the rest, seated or standing on the steps of the tomb to receive what is brought, or to welcome the visit of his friends. In this case we may perhaps recognise an allusion to the representation of the deceased that existed upon his stela; but the vase painter, rather than copy another work of art, prefers to give his own direct version of the presence of the deceased. Sometimes, however, the deceased is represented as actually painted or sculptured upon the tomb. Yet another form in which he may appear in these scenes on the vases is that of an *εἶδωλον*, a little butterfly-like figure of human form with wings. In the journey to Hades, Charon and his boat are constant fea-

tures, and he is evidently a realistic study in many cases from a rustic ferryman; sometimes the marshy bank of the Styx is represented by a group of rushes; and often Hermes appears as the guide and herald of the dead. The deceased often carries with him some of his funeral gifts to the ferry-boat; and sometimes, by a curious confusion of place, Charon and his skiff actually approach the tomb itself to fetch its occupant.

From the lecythi and the sculptured tombs together, we may gather some notion of how the Greeks thought of death and of the life beyond it. It is evident that there was some confusion, both in belief and in ritual, between various inconsistent views. The most prevalent notion seems to be of the continued existence of the dead in the neighbourhood of the place where his body lies, of his presence to receive the visits of his relatives and their offerings, of his appearing to them as he had been in life, or sometimes hovering as a diminutive ghost about them and their gifts. It is impossible not to recall in this connection the description of Plato in the *Phædo*, how those souls that had allowed themselves to be too much mixed up and contaminated with the body in their earthly life, found it impossible to free themselves from it entirely at death, but still hovered about the cemeteries. Side by side with this conception of the actual presence of the deceased at his tomb, and sometimes inextricably confused with it, we find some allusions to the myth of Charon, but not to any other incidents of the life beyond the grave. The myths of

Hades, of judgment and punishment or reward, that we read of in poets and philosophers, find no reflection in the popular feeling, so far as it is recorded for us by these monuments. In fact, it is not only for the beliefs of the people about death, but also for the representation of their life, that the sculptured tombs of the Athenians are valuable to us; for they supplement and correct in a remarkable way the impressions given by literature. Especially notable are the prominence of women on the tombs and the constant representations of husband and wife, of parents and children, in the intimacy of family life. This is a side of the Greeks that we might well overlook but for these monuments; yet we can hardly believe that what they turned to in moments of sorrow and therefore of the deepest feeling had not also, though not superficially conspicuous, a real influence on their life and character.

CHAPTER XII

ATHENS IN HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN TIMES

THE Athenian buildings with which we have hitherto been concerned were all of them the work of the Athenian people, the spontaneous product of their needs or aspirations; and even if some of them, especially those of the Periclean age, owed their origin to a single man, that man was himself the most representative of Athenians, and was only directing the tendency toward artistic expression that already existed among his fellow-citizens. In the Hellenistic age it is otherwise; the names alone of many of the chief buildings suffice to record that they were due to foreign munificence, not to the prosperity of the city or the public spirit of its inhabitants. The place that had been won for Athens in the estimation of the world by her poets, her philosophers, and her artists sufficed to secure, in most cases, the preservation of her monuments; but she had already begun to live on the reputation of her past rather than on her actual power and resources. The virtue had gone out of Greece to follow the conquests of Alexander to the East, and the centre of living art and literature was shifted to Alexandria, to Antioch, or to Pergamum.

Athens, however, had conferred such inestimable boons on the intellectual and artistic world that she was still recognised as consecrated by tradition to be the metropolis of Hellenism; and princes to whom Hellenism and civilisation were synonymous vied with one another in decorating the city with costly and magnificent edifices. In such buildings we cannot expect to find either the artistic perfection or the associations that belong to the products of an earlier age; but they are, some of them, so conspicuous even to the present day that no account of ancient Athens can ignore them.

In the earlier part of the Hellenistic age the prestige of Athens availed her to prevent destruction, as well as to cause her enrichment by new gifts. Alexander, in spite of her opposition to him, always treated her with respect; he is said to have sent back to Athens the statues of the Tyrannicides which Xerxes had taken away to Persia, and he dedicated on the Acropolis various spoils from the enemy who, a century and a half before his time, had destroyed its temples. Alexander posed as the champion of Greece and Europe in the hereditary feud with barbarism and with Asia, a feud that was traced back to the Trojan War or even earlier; and it is interesting to notice that by his time, and no doubt partly owing to his influence and that of his teacher Aristotle, Athens had acquired beyond dispute that preëminence among Hellenic cities which she had in vain striven to win for herself by diplomatic skill or by naval and military prowess. The example set by

Alexander was followed by his successors; and consequently, though Athens played no very glorious part in the years of strife and intrigue that followed his death, her buildings and monuments do not seem to have suffered very seriously from her vicissitudes.

A monument that was perhaps the last spontaneous product of democratic Athens, is also, curiously enough, the first recorded example of a form of architecture especially associated with imperial pride; this is a triumphal arch set up in the Agora after a small victory over the forces of Cassander in 318 B.C. It is to his credit that he left it standing when Athens was soon after at his mercy; and it was still to be seen in the time of Pausanias. We have already noticed that Demetrius of Phalerum, the philosopher and orator who administered the affairs of Athens, under the protection of Cassander, from 317 to 307 B.C., checked the sumptuous decoration of tombs. His great architectural work was the addition of a colossal portico to the great Hall of the Mysteries at Eleusis; this portico was designed by the architect Philo, who had also been employed by Lycurgus. In Athens, however, Demetrius of Phalerum does not seem to have left much trace of his activity, except in an incredible number of honorary statues of himself, three hundred and sixty set up in three hundred days; but this mushroom growth was destroyed even more quickly than it arose; only one is said to have been left on the Acropolis after his fall. About this time the most precious monuments of Athens seem to

have run the most serious danger of destruction ; for the tyrant Lachares is said to have actually stripped the gold from the statue of Athena Parthenos. Either his depredations have been exaggerated, or he was made to give up his spoils before he had destroyed them ; for the statue still continued, centuries after, to be one of the chief sights of Athens. The so-called restoration of freedom to Athens by Demetrius Poliorcetes might have been accompanied by still worse results. But although the Athenians consented to the grossest sacrilege when they lodged their liberator in the opisthodomus of the Parthenon, it is not recorded that this led to any damage to the building or its contents. This period is interesting for the associations which were confirming still more the position of Athens in the ancient world, as Zeno taught in the Painted Stoa that gave its name to his school, and Epicurus in his garden in Melite—not, as Plato and Aristotle, in suburban pleasantries. At this time, too, we have the first direct record of the population of the city ; Demetrius of Phalerum took a census, and found that Athens contained 21,000 citizens, 10,000 metics or aliens, and 400,000 slaves. These figures seem to imply a free population of 100,000 or more ; but the number of the slaves, which was probably far more difficult to ascertain, is thought by cautious investigators to be greatly exaggerated.

The first foreign prince to contribute in a direct way to the decoration of the town of Athens was Ptolemy, probably Philadelphus, who reigned from 285

to 247 B.C. He built a great gymnasium near the Agora, which must have been situated somewhere in the region behind the stoa of Attalus; this gymnasium was not only in all probability the most extensive and sumptuous building of its kind in the town, but it also contained a library. In both respects Ptolemy was conferring on Athens the same advantages of luxury and of culture that he had given to his own capital, Alexandria. Another gymnasium, founded about the same time in connection with a heroum dedicated to the Macedonian general Diogenes, and therefore called the Diogeneion, came to be used as the centre of the ephebic system in Athens, and so has left many inscriptions, though there are but scanty traces of its plan. It may almost claim, in a sense, to have been for a time the university of Athens, since it was there that the ephebi, the body of the Athenian youths under military and intellectual training, received their lectures on literature and geometry and rhetoric and music; and it was there that they set up the numerous honorary portraits of their successive *κοσμηταὶ* or censors, which we may still see in the Athenian Museum.

Another great dynasty of princes who allowed Athens, as the metropolis of Hellenic culture, to share the magnificence which they lavished on their own capital, was that of the kings of Pergamum. Attalus I. visited Athens in 201 B.C., and it may well have been on this occasion that he dedicated on the Acropolis a series of statues to commemorate his victories over the

Gauls in Asia Minor. These were set up on the wall of the Acropolis just above the Theatre of Dionysus, and consisted of a number of bronze figures, about half life-size. Marble copies of them have been found scattered through the museums of Europe; and we can identify in them examples of all the four subjects mentioned by Pausanias — the battles of the Gods and Giants, of the Athenians and Amazons, of the Athenians and the Persians at Marathon, and of Attalus and his people against the Gauls in Mysia. If, on the one hand, Attalus compared his own exploits with the prowess of the Athenians at Marathon, and with the mythical contests in which they were fond of finding an antitype for the Persian Wars, on the other hand he flattered their vanity by an indirect reference to their holding Thermopylæ in 278 B.C., against the same terrible enemies whom he defeated in Asia. His son, Eumenes, who continued his father's work both in the subjugation of the Gauls and the increase of the magnificence of Pergamum, surpassed him also in benefactions to the Athenians; for he built the great portico that is known by his name, and that stretches from the Theatre of Dionysus to the Odeum of Herodes. This portico was especially designed to shelter the spectators in the Theatre in case of a sudden shower; but it also gave a splendid finish to the south side of the Acropolis. The most conspicuous part of it now, the row of arches that supported the terrace behind, was invisible when the building was complete; it was faced with a wall of squared

masonry, which still exists in places; this wall was of Piraic limestone in its upper portion, but had on its lower part a dado of Hymettian marble. In front of it was a double portico of splendid proportions; only its foundation and a few fragments of its columns, which have recently been recovered, remain to testify to its



STOA OF ATTALUS.

original character; at the west end it has been to some extent modified when the adjoining Odeum was built.


Attalus II., the successor of Eumenes, also presented to the Athenians a magnificent stoa, of which the remains may still be seen; it is standing to a considerable height at the two ends, and owes its preservation to having been partly built into one of the late walls of Athens. This

stoa was close to the Agora, and enclosed on one side either the original open space or a later extension of it. The ground plan of the building may be made out to some extent from the view of it that is here given. It consisted of a great portico of two stories, open toward the Agora, and supported by double rows of columns; at either end was an exedra or recess, with marble seats, and at the back was a row of small square chambers, which must have served as shops or offices. The whole was probably, from the point of view of luxury and convenience, a great advance on anything that had existed in Athens before. An inscription in large letters on the architrave, still partially preserved on the spot, records its dedication by Attalus.

Another Asiatic monarch, Antiochus Epiphanes, of Syria, conceived an even more ambitious project for the decoration of Athens. This was the completion of the colossal temple of the Olympian Zeus, which had remained unfinished since the time of Pisistratus, all through the most glorious days of Athens. It was to the project of Antiochus, which was interrupted by his death in 164 B.C., that Livy applies the distinguished praise, "*unum in terris inchoatum pro magnitudine dei.*" Although the foundations partly belong to the time of Pisistratus, and the completion of the building, including possibly some of what we now see, dates from the time of Hadrian, it is to Antiochus that we must give credit for the design of this colossal temple, which was one of the most famous in the ancient world. Curiously enough,



THE OLYMPIEUM FROM SOUTHEAST.
Acropolis behind.



the architect employed by this Oriental king for a temple in Athens was a Roman citizen, Cossutius, who, to judge from the way in which his nationality is dwelt on by Vitruvius, was probably not, like most artists with Roman names, of Greek origin. Vitruvius' description of the proportions and architectural character of the temple seems to imply that it had at least advanced so far toward completion that it was possible, not only for an architect, but for the public generally to appreciate it. The first part of a temple to be erected was the columns; and it seems probable that a considerable part of the great double colonnade of Corinthian columns that surrounded the temple was completed before the work was stopped by Antiochus' death. Sulla is said to have carried



CAPITAL OF COLUMN IN OLYMPIEUM.

off some of the columns to place them in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome; these may either have been unfinished ones prepared for the Athenian temple, or, possibly, some of those that had already been erected. The temple had two rows of columns all round it, and eight columns in its front, so that the temple within was tetrastyle, and the cella must have been

rather long and narrow; it was also open to the sky, and is quoted by Vitruvius as an example of the hypæthral temple—a description which, being supposed to apply to the Parthenon, has aroused much confusion.¹ The columns show the Corinthian order in its full development, and are, perhaps, the finest extant example of that order; they are fifty-six feet seven inches high. The style of the extant columns certainly has nothing in it to preclude their attribution to the Hellenistic age. Another abortive scheme for the completion of the temple was proposed in the time of Augustus, when it was suggested that all the subject kings and peoples of the empire should join in the work, and dedicate it to the Genius of the Emperor. It was, however, reserved for Hadrian to complete what had so often been begun and left unfinished. We cannot tell exactly how much of the structure was left for him to build; but there is no reason to suppose he modified in any essential features the plan of Cossutius. In the temple he placed a colossal gold and ivory statue which was probably a more or less free copy of the great statue by Phidias at Olympia.

Another monument that is, owing to its excellent preservation, a conspicuous feature of modern Athens, was given to the town by a private individual; this is the Tower of the Winds, as it is commonly called, or the Horologium, built by Andronicus of Cyrrhus in Syria. The building consists of an octagonal tower,

¹ See Dörpfeld, *Ath. Mitth.* XVI. 334.

with one of the eight winds carved in relief near the top of each side; each wind is represented by a symbolical figure with appropriate attributes, and also has his name inscribed. Thus Boreas, the North Wind, is fully clad, rugged and bearded, and blows through a shell like a Triton; Notus, the rainy South Wind, is soft and youthful, and holds an inverted pitcher; Zephyr, almost nude, bears a garment full of flowers, and Lips, the South-west Wind, carries the aplustre (or stern-ornament) of a ship, either as a trophy of his violence or because he blows the ships home to Athens up the Saronic Gulf. The allegory is artificial, but readily understood; at the same time one feels that these wind gods are mere decorative impersonations, no longer divinities in whose existence the artist pretends to believe, and the design, though not without merit, is rather clumsy, especially in the legs of the floating figures. Vitruvius has left us a description of the building, from which we know that in his time it was surmounted by a bronze Triton, who served as a weathercock, and turned with the wind so as to point with his staff to the figure representing the quarter from which it was blowing. On each of the sides that caught the sun, lines were incised, to make it serve as a sundial, by the aid of a projecting bar of metal. This was not, however, the only appliance that justified the name of Horologium, sometimes given to the building, and served to indicate the time. There appears to have been a water-clock also, and there are curious bowls and

troughs cut in the floor, and connected with a small cistern at the back. It is not known exactly how these worked, but there must probably have been some indi-



TOWER OF THE WINDS.

The three winds visible are Boreas (north), Sciron (north-west), and Zephyr (west).

cator attached to tell the time, as shown by the amount of water in the channels. The interior of the building was made readily accessible by two doors, each faced

with a small Corinthian portico. The Tower of the Winds is interesting, not only for its unique plan and purpose, but also for its position. It is situated to the north of the Acropolis, and at some considerable distance from what we have noticed as the probable site of the Agora. Yet such a building, which served the purpose of a clock-tower in the market-place of a modern town, must have been placed in the most convenient position, close to the centre of commerce and social life. It therefore offers the earliest evidence that the market-place of Roman times was already, when it was built, shifting toward the east; we shall notice later that important commercial buildings were soon after erected around it in this region. Its exact date is not recorded, though we have a limit provided by its mention in the writings of Varro and Vitruvius; it must belong either to the second century B.C. or the earlier part of the first.

By rashly taking the part of Mithridates the Great in his struggle with Rome, Athens drew upon herself, in 86 B.C., the summary vengeance of Sulla, who seems to have treated her with less respect than any previous conqueror. We have already noticed his destruction of the wall between the Sacred and Piraic gates. The mound which he threw up against the city in this region has, incidentally, proved a benefit to us, for underneath it were buried intact many of the interesting tombstones of the Ceramicus. He does not seem, however, to have actually destroyed any buildings, though he carried off some columns from the Olympieum; he is only indi-

rectly responsible for the destruction of the Odeum of Pericles, situated beside the Theatre. This was constructed mostly of wood, the spars of the Persian ships; and the tyrant Aristion, when he took refuge in the Acropolis, burnt it down, lest the wood should prove serviceable to Sulla in attacking the citadel. It is characteristic of the time that the vandalism of an Athenian should have been repaired by a barbarian; King Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia undertook to rebuild the Odeum, and he must have succeeded well enough for it still to be shown to visitors to Athens in succeeding centuries.

So far all the foreign contributors to the architectural splendour of Athens have come from the East; they turned to Athens as the home of the art and civilisation to which the Hellenistic world owed its character. When we reach the epoch of Roman dominion, we find Hellenism again prevalent among the cultured classes of the West no less than in the East, though in this case it was not the system imposed by Greek conquerors upon their subjects, but the reaction of the literature and art of the conquered people upon the barbarian victor. The result to Athens was the same; the debt due to her artistic and intellectual preëminence in the ancient world was again acknowledged by the erection of temples, porticoes, libraries, and other buildings by the munificence of Roman magistrates and emperors. The earliest example in Attica of which any remains are left is offered by the smaller Propylæa at Eleusis, built by Appius Claudius Pulcher in 48 B.C., a gift that Cicero himself thought of

emulating; his words to his friend Atticus on the subject offer an excellent illustration of the feeling of Romans of his class about the matter; he says:¹ "I hear Appius is building a *πρόπυλον* at Eleusis; would it be out of the way for me too to build one at the Academy? You will say 'yes'; then write to me and say so. I have a great affection for Athens itself; I should like to leave some memorial of it, and hate the custom of inscribing one's own name on statues set up by another."

It was especially under the emperors that Athens came to benefit by this feeling. We have already noticed that the completion of the Olympieum had suggested itself to the subject princes and peoples as an acceptable compliment to Augustus; and although this project came to nothing, other important contributions to the convenience of the Athenians date from his reign. The most important of these is a great market hall, or square surrounded with porticoes, of which a portion has recently been unearthed near the Tower of the Winds; the great gateway leading into it from the side of the older Agora has long been among the conspicuous monuments of Athens; it consists of a row of four Doric columns, with a wider intercolumniation in the middle, and on its architrave is an inscription recording its erection from moneys given by Julius Cæsar and by Augustus; it was dedicated to Athena Archegetis. Upon the top of the pediment was set a statue of Lucius Cæsar, who was adopted by Augustus in 12 B.C., and was regarded as successor to the

¹ *Ep. ad Att.* VI. 1.



GATE OF ROMAN MARKET.
Dedicated to Athena Archegetis.

empire till his death, thirteen years later. At the other side of the square, near the Tower of the Winds, are the foundations of a second entrance. An inscription just within the Gate of Athena Archegetis deals with the regulations of the oil market, and hence it is supposed that the building was mainly devoted to the traffic in this, perhaps the most important of the natural products of Athens. However this may be, the spread of great market halls in this direction confirms the impression given by the position chosen for the Tower of the Winds, that the commercial Agora at Athens had moved in Roman times some distance to the east of its site in Greek times. Yet another building, of which some

arches are still standing, close to the Tower of the Winds, bears a dedication to Athena Archegetis and the members of the imperial family.

Another dedication, to Rome and Augustus, is still to be seen in the most conspicuous position on the Acropolis, in the open space in front of the Parthenon. It took the form of a small circular temple of the Ionic order; the forms of the columns and of the architectural decoration were closely modelled upon the Erechtheum, but they entirely lack the distinction of fine workmanship that gives to those forms their proper value. The inscription, which is carved in large letters upon the architrave, records that the temple was dedicated to Rome and Augustus by the people of Athens. We must therefore attribute to the degenerate Athenians, and not to any outside influence, the lack of taste which allowed them to set, in a place that had for so long a time been kept clear so as to allow the Parthenon to have its full effect, a temple which had nothing, either in its associations or its artistic character, to justify its position. Another monument of the same age which must also be reckoned as a disfigurement rather than an ornament to the Acropolis, is the great basis for the equestrian statue of Agrippa, which still stands in such a position as to mar the effect of the Propylæa and the general aspect of the entrance of the Acropolis. The people of Athens, who were again responsible, had indeed good reason to honour Agrippa, both for his services in general and for the theatre which he had built them

in the Ceramicus. This theatre was a building intended for lectures; there is no authority for the name Odeum, sometimes given to it, nor have we any certain evidence as to its position; it was sometimes briefly called the Agrippeum. On the side of the Propylæa opposite the pedestal of Agrippa there is an inscription to Germanicus, cut on a basis that carried also its original inscription,¹ recording a dedication by the knights of Athens, sometime before the middle of the fifth century, of a statue from the spoils of a victory. It is probable that we have here only an example of the practice deprecated by Cicero, of putting new inscriptions on old monuments; for Pausanias saw the original statue, and its fellow on the other side of the Propylæa, when he visited Athens, and mistook them, owing to a name mentioned in the inscription, for those of the sons of Xenophon.

The reigns of the succeeding emperors have not left much trace upon Athens. Even the visit of Nero does not seem to have led to any additions, beyond the new stage which we have noticed in the Theatre; he also dedicated the shields of which the traces may still be seen on the architrave of the Parthenon.²

A monument which, owing to its position and the accident of its preservation, is one of the first to attract the attention of a visitor to Athens at the present day,

¹ There is some confusion about this inscription, which was twice cut, once with the block inverted; but it must refer to the original erection of the statue.

² This fact has been discovered and the inscription deciphered by Mr. Andrews, in 1896.

is that of Philopappus, which crowns the Museum Hill. His full name was C. Julius Antiochus Philopappus, and he was the descendant of a dynasty of kings of Commagene, who had also held various Roman magis-



MONUMENT OF PHILOPAPPUS.

tracies. The monument was set up between 114 and 116 A.D. It consists of a lofty structure, with a concave curve on the side facing the Acropolis. Its lower part is taken up by a frieze, representing the deceased in a

chariot with his insignia of office; above these were three niches, in which were statues, now only partially preserved, of Philopappus himself, of his grandfather, from whom he took his name, the last king of the dynasty, and of Seleucus Nicator, its founder. The position of the monument is chiefly famous for its magnificent view of the Acropolis.


The latest epoch in which ancient Athens received a considerable addition to its public buildings was that of Hadrian. While his imperial munificence beautified a great number of the chief cities of the empire, Athens was especially selected for his attention, as was only to be expected both from its traditions and from the Emperor's predilections. We have already noticed that he at last completed the colossal temple of the Olympian Zeus; but this was only a portion of a more comprehensive scheme, which is sufficiently attested by the inscriptions which he caused to be incised on the two sides of the arch which is still standing close to the great temple. On the one side, facing the old town, is the line:—

αἰδ' εἰς' Ἀθῆναι, Θεσέως ἡ πρὶν πόλις,


on the other:—

αἰδ' εἰς' Ἀδριανοῦ, κοῖχι Θεσέως πόλις.

By this somewhat pompous claim, he deliberately places his benefits to Athens on the same footing as those of Theseus, who first formed one great city out of the scattered townships of Attica, and alludes to his foundation of Novæ Athenæ, a considerable exten-



sion of the town beyond the limits of the old wall, in the region now occupied by the Constitution Square (*Σύνταγμα*) and the royal palace and garden. The precinct of the Olympieum was filled with statues of the Emperor, as was also the Theatre, where we have already noticed the alterations made in his honour. Other buildings erected by Hadrian in Athens were on



WEST END OF LIBRARY OF HADRIAN.

a correspondingly magnificent scale. One of these, of which considerable remains may still be seen, is probably the building described by Pausanias as decorated with a hundred columns of Phrygian marble, and with a similar decoration on the walls of the porticoes that surrounded it, with chambers finished with gold and alabaster, with paintings and with statues. This building surrounded a great court in which there was originally a basin of water; later this was filled up, and

curved porticoes were erected above its place; these were later built into a church, but parts of their mosaic pavements still remain. There were exedræ, curved and oblong, in addition to the chambers; and in the chambers was stored a fine library. At each end



ODEUM OF REGILLA.


Built by Herodes Atticus; outside.

this magnificent building, of which we have no special name recorded, unless it was called the Library of Hadrian,¹ was terminated by a wall decorated outside by engaged columns, which are still to some extent preserved. Other buildings constructed by Hadrian in Athens were a gymnasium with a hundred columns of Libyan marble.

¹ The common name, Stoa of Hadrian, rests on no ancient authority.



ODEUM OF REGILLA.
Built by Herodes Atticus; interior view.



temples of Hera and of Zeus Panhellenius, and a pantheon or temple of all the gods, in which he set up a record of his various benefactions to the cities of his empire, partly quoted by Pausanias. Near the Tower of the Winds was also the Agoranomion, or official market hall, belonging to the same age.

The munificence of the Emperor to Athens was emulated by one of its citizens, who must be recorded as the last great Athenian who made a material contribution to the beauty of his native city. This was Herodes Atticus, a philosopher and rhetorician who held many public offices in Athens, and contributed to keep up the splendour of public worship, especially by his great celebration of the Panathenaic games. On this occasion he provided the Athenian Stadium with seats of Pentelic marble, and is said to have exhausted the old Pentelic quarries for the purpose. His greatest work, however, was the Odeum, which he built in memory of his wife Regilla, and which is still in a good state of preservation. Its exterior, with arches of Piraic limestone, is a most conspicuous feature in any view of the south side of the Acropolis. Within, the ranges of seats are well preserved, and the position of the low stage, and of the steps leading up to it from the orchestra, may readily be distinguished. It resembles in most respects the theatre of Roman type as described by Vitruvius. It was the largest and most splendid building of its kind in Greece; indeed, its size was such as to suit it for any dramatic purposes, and not only for the musical per-

formances and contests suggested by its name. It was completely covered by a roof of cedar wood, and, considering its great size, this must have been no mean work of engineering.

Some remains have been found of other buildings which may probably be assigned to about the same



ROMAN BATHS.

Near Olympieum; east end of Acropolis in background.

age — notably those of baths, some within the royal garden, some in the garden near the Zappeion, — both of them in Hadrian's new quarter. But the enumeration need be extended no farther. With the age of Hadrian, and the visit of Pausanias,

the picture of ancient Athens which we can bring before our eyes may be regarded as complete, so far as it can here be presented.

There is, however, one event that still calls for some mention, partly because it is the beginning of the new order of things, partly because certain misconceptions are common in regard to it. This is the visit of St. Paul to Athens. The record, as given in the Acts

of the Apostles, is as follows: Paul, like Socrates, disputed in the Agora daily with those that met with him; then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics, wishing to hear what he had to say more quietly and at more leisure than was possible in the crowded market-place, led him up on to the Areopagus, and there he addressed them. At the end of his speech some mocked, and others said, "We will hear thee again of this matter." So Paul departed from among them. The narrative is perfectly simple and intelligible, and there need have been no confusion about it, but for the unfortunate suggestion that he was placed on trial before the court of Areopagus, which at that time sat, not on the hill from which it takes its name, but in the Stoa Basileios in the Agora.¹ It is evident that Paul had done nothing to bring him within the jurisdiction of the court, nor is there, in the account we possess, any hint of his being summoned to appear before it, tried, or acquitted. The name Areopagus is used in its local sense, referring to the hill itself, not to the court. There is, therefore, no need to disturb the associations connected with a spot that is consecrated by the first energy of the new religion as well as by some of the most hallowed traditions of the old.

The history of Athens in the concluding age of the old religion and philosophy, and of its schools and

¹ This view is maintained by Curtius; it is carefully refuted by A. F. Findlay in the *Annual of British School at Athens*, 1894-1895.

intellectual life, offers a fascinating subject for study; but we know too little of the manner in which it affected the external appearance of the city to have occasion to dwell on it here. In addition to the old resorts of philosophers, the porticoes of the Agora, and the gardens of the Academy and the Lyceum, there were doubtless many lecture halls like that built by Agrippa. The prestige of Athens had probably saved her to a great degree from the wholesale spoliation of works of art that transferred so many of the finest statues to Rome or to Constantinople; on the official establishment of Christianity, many statues, including the gold and ivory statue in the Parthenon, probably met a more summary fate. We have already noticed the way in which many temples, among them the Parthenon, the Erechtheum, and the Theseum, were preserved more or less intact by being transferred to the service of Christianity; their further vicissitudes at the hand of Greek and Latin, Turk and Frank, only concern us so far as they have left their traces on the buildings; the most disastrous of all were the bombardment and capture of the Acropolis by the Venetians under Morosini in 1687, and by the Turks during the War of Independence in 1827.

We do not know how long the circuit of the town walls remained as it had been planned by Themistocles, with the extension toward the east added by Hadrian. The walls were restored in later imperial times. A more modern line of fortification, implying that the town had

shrunk to comparatively small dimensions, is probably to be assigned to the period of the Dukes of Athens; this contributed both to the destruction and to the subsequent preservation of some ancient buildings, for it included in its line the Stoa of Attalus and the north wall of the Library of Hadrian. These indications suffice to show its position; it enclosed the space immediately to the north of the Acropolis, to which its two extremities were joined; at the same time, probably, an outwork was built to include the scena of the Dionysiac Theatre and of the Odeum of Herodes Atticus, and this outwork has, in the latter case, led to the preservation of the building.

When Athens was selected as the capital of the new kingdom of Greece, under Otto of Bavaria, the German archæologist Ross was appointed to the administration of antiquities, and had his large and far-seeing projects been carried out, Athenian topography would probably have offered, at the present day, a more limited field for conjecture. He wished to remove, as far as possible, all houses and traces of modern occupation, not only from the Acropolis and its immediate vicinity, but also from what was the most central point of the ancient town, to the north of the Acropolis and Areopagus. The modern town, with its broad, straight streets and principal buildings, the Royal Palace, the University, the Academy, and the National Museum, is indeed laid out almost entirely on the level ground to the north of the Acropolis and on the slope of Lycabettus. But the old town of

Turkish times, with its bazaars and narrow, winding streets, still clings to the north slope of the Acropolis. Something is perhaps gained by this in picturesque effect; but the older and more characteristic features of this quarter are rapidly disappearing, to make way for modern houses, and thus the project of Ross, to clear this region entirely, and leave it open after excavation as a public park, is now farther than ever from realisation. The exact position of the Agora and the buildings round it therefore remains, and seems likely to remain for the present, a matter of conjecture. From the Acropolis, however, and its immediate surroundings, all the remains of post-classical ages have been removed, partly by Ross and partly by his successors, with a zeal that has not escaped criticism in some instances—notably in the case of the tall Frankish tower that stood in front of the temple of Nike, and that forms so conspicuous a feature in all views of the Acropolis previous to 1875. On the whole, whatever errors in detail may have been committed, it is impossible for any one who compares the present state of the Acropolis with that shown in old views of the beginning of the nineteenth century, not to admit that the changes have been for the better. Then the scanty remains of ancient buildings were partly buried beneath accumulations of débris, partly hidden or obstructed by the mean hovels of modern occupants; now they are cleared so that they can be seen, so far as they are still standing, as clearly as they could be seen in

ancient times, and there is nothing to hinder the student in tracing out their plans or noting the relation and workmanship of their fallen portions.

Another matter on which considerable difference of opinion is possible is the question of restoration. When all the portions of an ancient building are lying around its foundation, it may seem at first sight a harmless and even desirable proceeding to rebuild it again out of its original materials. We have, however, seen, in the case of the Parthenon, a warning of the impossibility of replacing the drums of a Doric column when once they have fallen; the fluting of the columns can never regain that perfect regularity which it obtained at first by being carried out after the column was erected; and in its absence, the result is an unsatisfactory and even revolting appearance, as of a galvanised corpse. In the case of the little temple of Nike, indeed, the restored building is a distinct gain to a distant view of the Acropolis, and reproduces pretty nearly the original effect; though even here the lines of the temple, when seen from near, are displeasing to the eye. The very perfection of Greek architectural form makes its reconstruction from dismembered blocks an impossibility. The Erechtheum is perhaps the most extensively restored building in Athens; and here, too, the patchy effect is painful, partly, no doubt, owing to the extensive use of brick, but partly also to the inherent conditions of the task. The policy dictated alike by theory and by experience is a simple one — not, as a rule, to attempt to replace what has already fallen, but to

strengthen, where necessary, whatever is left standing, so that no more may fall. This principle is being acted upon in an admirable manner in the present restoration of the Parthenon, which is being carried out under the advice of an international commission. New blocks of marble are being used where necessary to replace those that are hopelessly shattered, or to support those that are in danger of falling; but these new blocks are placed, as far as possible, where they are invisible or inconspicuous; the object is to leave the appearance of the building unchanged, while its stability is increased. From the point of view of sentiment, as well as of artistic effect, this is the most desirable result; and the student will find nothing to deceive him or hinder his investigations. If we could hope ever to see the Acropolis as it was seen by Pausanias, considerable sacrifices might be tolerated for such a consummation. But, since this is impossible, the best policy is to provide that succeeding generations may not have to deplore the loss of anything that we can now enjoy.

CHAPTER XIII

PAUSANIAS IN ATHENS

ὁ δὲ ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ μοι τῇ Ἀτθίδι ἐπανόρθωμα ἐγένετο, μὴ τὰ πάντα με ἐφεξῆς τὰ δὲ μάλιστα ἄξια μνήμης ἐπιλεξάμενον ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰρηκέναι, δηλώσω δὴ πρὸ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἐς Σπαρτιάτας· ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἠθέλησεν ὁ λόγος ἀπὸ πολλῶν καὶ οὐκ ἄξιων ἀφηγήσεως, ὧν ἕκαστοι παρὰ σφίσι λέγουσιν, ἀποκρίναι τὰ ἀξιολογώτατα. ὥς οὖν εὖ βεβουλευμένος (οὐκ)¹ ἔστιν ὅπου παραβῆσομαι.

— Paus. III. xi. 1.

NOTHING would help us to realise the appearance of the town of Athens, after so many different ages had contributed to its beauty or splendour, so well as an imaginary walk among its streets and temples; and, happily, a guide and companion for such a walk offers himself in the person of Pausanias, who did in the time of Hadrian just what we should wish to do, and has left us a full description of what he saw, and of much that was told him about it. Before, however, we can trust ourselves to his guidance, we must qualify ourselves to appreciate his descriptions and avoid the necessity of interruptions in the course of his narration, by some preliminary inquiries as to his methods in general, and as to the particular route or routes which he followed in his

¹ This οὐκ, which gives another meaning to the sentence, was evidently inserted by some scribe who misunderstood the words. Pausanias means, "I shall intentionally omit many things."

ramble through Athens. Both of these questions have given rise to much discussion and to many treatises; here it will only be possible to give a summary of what appear to be the most probable conclusions.

In the first place, it is clear that Pausanias was a man who actually travelled in Greece, and made notes on the spot, somewhat indiscriminately, perhaps, especially in the earlier portion of his work. He worked these notes up later into the book which we now possess; and he has told us, in the sentence quoted at the beginning of this chapter, how he intended from the first to select only the more interesting and important things that he saw or heard; and that, in revising the notes for his first book on Attica, he had to apply this process of selection even more stringently. When writing his book he doubtless made use of earlier authors, especially historians, to amplify the information in his notes; but both the matter and the manner of his descriptions of the places he visited preclude the notion that his work was that of a mere compiler, who had perhaps seen the places he describes, but who depended mainly for his facts upon the published works of others. On the contrary, his very mistakes are such as are only explicable in the case of a man who had made in his travels rough notes, which he sometimes misread or misunderstood afterwards; and any one who reads Pausanias upon an ancient site, where his words can be confronted with the revelations of recent excavation, cannot fail to realise that he has before him the work of an honest and trustworthy, if

somewhat uncritical, traveller, full of an antiquarian interest in the records of early religion and art, and eager to hear and to chronicle the information that was provided in plentiful measure for travellers like him by the professional guides and cicerones who were to be found on all the chief sites in Greece. The information given by such a class of men was probably no more trustworthy in those days than it is now; but, such as it was, it is recorded for us by a writer who had before his eyes the objects to which it referred.

The route followed by Pausanias in his walks through Athens is clear in the main, but has given rise to almost endless dispute and discussion as regards certain parts of it. It is necessary, in an attempt at a continuous account, to choose in these cases what appears to be the most probable course, and to reserve the discussion of alternatives for a note at the end of this chapter. To prevent any misunderstanding, a clear warning must be given here that there is sometimes insufficient evidence to justify the apparent dogmatism of the text, which is merely a matter of convenience.

Pausanias¹ approached Athens by sea, and landed at the Piræus, of which he gives a short account. He first describes the approach to Athens by the Phaleric road. Beside this road he saw the roofless and doorless walls of a temple of Hera, said to have been burnt by the Persians when they captured Athens. This

¹ Throughout this sketch I am indebted to Mr. Frazer's notes, and wish to make a general acknowledgment here, in addition to quoting him in special cases.

was one of those left in ruins to remind the Athenians of the event; in strange contrast with it must have been the statue of the goddess made by Alcamenes. Just within the Itonian Gate was the monument of the Amazon Antiope. Had he continued in this direction he would next have come to the Olympieum, and so the whole of his route would have been different. But he evidently was informed, on reaching the city, that the right place to begin a visit to Athens was at the Dipylon Gate, which offered the most convenient means of access from the harbour town to the centre of civic life, and which was accordingly supplied with an imposing avenue leading to the Agora. A consideration that would appeal still more strongly to Pausanias was that it was from the Dipylon that the sacred procession started at the Panathenæa and on other festal occasions. Accordingly he repeated his approach to the city, this time by the road from the Piræus, which followed much the same line as the modern carriage road. This had the advantage also of leading him past some ruins that were closely associated with the greatness and the fall of Athens — the remains of the Long Walls, restored in Conon's time after their destruction at the close of the Peloponnesian War, but finally dismantled by Sulla, and no longer, under the empire, of any service. As he drew near to the city, he saw the tombs, not so numerous along this road as on some others, but including among them those of Menander and Euripides, the latter a

cenotaph, for the poet died at the court of Archelaus in Macedonia.

Pausanias did not enter the city by the Piraic Gate, up the hill to the right, but kept to the convenient and level road which entered by the Dipylon Gate, joining there the Sacred Way from Eleusis. Here he did not stop to examine the numerous tombs, knowing that he should pass them again later, on leaving the city, but passed on at once within the walls. Here the first thing he saw on entering was a building of which the walls can still in all probability be recognised, the storehouse in which were kept the "properties" and appliances for the processions that started from this spot. Probably, however, he did not enter this hall, for he does not mention the paintings or the statues—among them those of Socrates and Isocrates—which it contained. Near by was a temple of Demeter and Persephone and Iacchus, the statues by Praxiteles;¹ it was probably a sort of house of call for the sacred processions, as they passed out of the city from the Agora, to follow the Sacred Way to Eleusis, and emphasised the start of the processional road outward, just as the storehouse indicated the beginning of the festal route into the city. From the space just within the Dipylon Gate, as he turned to approach the Agora, or, as he calls it, the Ceramicus,² he

¹ Those who believe in an elder Praxiteles take this as their chief evidence, because of the inscription on the wall in "Attic letters." But the matter is very doubtful. See Frazer's note, *ad loc.*

² This use of the word is not found in early times. Ceramicus used alone in earlier writers usually means the outer Ceramicus, the cemetery.

saw before him, sloping gently upward, a broad avenue, bordered on each side by porticoes, which extended its whole length.¹ Thus Athens, at first sight, must have given the impression of a fine and regularly laid out city like the Piræus—an impression soon after to be dispelled by the narrow and winding streets of its older quarters.

Behind the portico on the left were temples of various gods, and a gymnasium, called that of Hermes. There was also another building which has more definite associations for us—the house of Pulytion, once proverbial for its magnificence. Its former owner was one of the accomplices of Alcibiades in the travesty of the Eleusinian mysteries that was held partly in this house, partly by night in the orchestra of the Dionysiac Theatre; the mutilation of the Hermæ was attributed to these same revellers; and Pulytion's house was dedicated to Dionysus, probably to pacify the god for the profanation of his theatre. In it there were set up statues of Dionysus Melpomenos, and also a group of gods, including Athena the Healer, made and dedicated by the sculptor Eubulides. The foundation of a colossal group of statuary, with the name of the sculptor Eubulides, was found in 1837 just to the west of the church of the Asomata, and opposite the railway station in the

¹ I see no difficulty in recognising this as the road in *Him. Or. III. 12, ὅς ἐὶθ' ὁδὸς τε καὶ λείος καταβαίνων ἄνωθεν σχίζει τὰς ἐκατέρωθεν παρατεταμέας στοάς*. Surely one can ascend a road which slopes gently down from the Agora. No possible position for a gate on this side can be found, whence a road would slope down toward the Agora.

Hermes Street. It is very probable that the basis is the one seen by Pausanias.¹ If so, we know the exact position of the house of Pulytion, and may fairly infer that of the other buildings that were near it. The head from the statue of Athena, found near the basis, and now in the Museum at Athens, probably belongs to the group; and, if so, it is of peculiar interest, as representing the only statue now extant — apart from architectural sculptures — which we can identify as having been actually seen by Pausanias during his visit to Athens. Adjoining the house of Pulytion was another shrine of Dionysus, with clay figures representing the entertainment of the god by King Amphictyon, and a statue of Pegasus of Eleutheræ, who was said to have been the first to transfer the local cult of his town to Athens. This shrine, near the town gate, seems to bear the same relation to the annual progress of Dionysus to the Academy that the temple of Demeter bears to the Eleusinian procession.

At the other end of the broad avenue leading up from the Dipylon Gate, Pausanias entered the Agora, the old centre of Athenian civic life, though in his time the commercial market-place had probably been shifted farther to the east. He entered it at its lowest corner, and, as seen from this point of view, it appeared as a rather irregular open space, surrounded by porticoes and temples. In front of these and around them were numerous statues

¹ It is true that the inscription does not mention the dedication by Eubulides; but on such large groups it was common to have several inscriptions.

of gods and distinguished men; and a certain row or group of these were especially known as the *Hermæ*, being probably of the conventional form of square pillars with a head carved at the top—a shape by no means restricted to this set, but common throughout Athens; in the open space there were some altars and other objects, but it was for the most part clear. The Agora was in a slight depression; above it, at the back, rose the rock of the Areopagus, and several of its buildings at the upper end were situated on the lower slope of the hill. On the right arose, behind the buildings of the Agora, the low mound of the Market Hill — *Κολωνὸς Ἀγοραῖος* — with several temples upon it, among them that which we now call the Theseum. On the left side also the ground sloped slightly up from the Agora, but any view in this direction was completely shut off by the lofty Stoa of Attalus.

Pausanias turned first to the right on entering the Agora, and here the building next the entrance was the Portico of the King, or Stoa Basileios. This served as the office of the titular king, the magistrate who had charge of religious matters; and here too the court of Areopagus sat in later times. But these uses were provided for by temporary expedients; the building itself which he saw merely consisted of a long colonnade, open toward the Agora, and with a solid wall or chambers at the back; on the gable at each end was a group of terracotta figures standing out against the sky—Theseus hurling Sciron into the sea, and Eos flying away with

the youth Cephalus. In front of the stoa was a row of statues, among them that of Conon, who restored the naval power of Athens after the close of the Peloponnesian War, and his friend Evagoras of Cyprus, one of the most heroic champions of Hellenism in the East. Here too, a little farther on, was a statue of Zeus Eleutherios, set up to commemorate the great delivery of the Greeks from the Persians, and behind it another portico, called after this statue, and having within it paintings by Euphranor. At one end were the twelve gods, at the other an allegorical group of Theseus and Democracy and Demos or the Athenian people, the latter personified by a single figure. The back of the portico was filled by one of the most spirited battle pictures of antiquity, the battle of Mantinea by the same artist; the most prominent figures were Epaminondas among the Theban cavalry, and Gryllus the son of Xenophon among the Athenian knights; possibly the central group was a single combat between these two, in which Gryllus was victorious.

Near by was the temple of Apollo Patrous, with a statue also by Euphranor inside, and two other statues of Apollo by famous sculptors, Calamis and Leochares, standing in front of the temple.

Pausanias now turned from the western side of the Agora and approached a group of buildings situated at its upper or southern end, just below the slope of the Areopagus. These buildings were all of them connected with the official life of Athens. The first of them was the Metroum, the temple of the Mother of the Gods,

with a statue of her by Phidias; from the convenience of its position this served as the public record office. Close beside it stood the Senate House of the Five Hundred; within it Pausanias saw a wooden statue of Zeus, God of Counsel, and an image of Demos, the People, by Lyson. There were pictures, too; one by Protogenes of the Thesmothetæ, or six minor archons, — perhaps a portrait group, — and a portrait of Callippus, who led the Athenians to hold Thermopylæ against the invading Gauls, an exploit which reminded the later Athenians of their ancient glory at Marathon. Here, too, was the Tholos, with the Sacred Hearth of the state, where the Prytanes sacrificed and where they had their official residence — a building which offered a contrast to the flat lines of porticoes and temples, since it was circular and surmounted by a domelike top.

Higher up on the slope of the Areopagus were the statues of the Eponymi, the heroes after whom the different tribes of Athens were named, a place of great resort and excitement in earlier days, when the lists of those drawn for military service or other purposes were affixed to the statues. The heroes of the ten tribes established by Clisthenes were Erechtheus, Ægeus, Pandion, Leos, Acamas, Æneus, Cecrops, Hippothoon, Ajax, and Antiochus, — all legendary kings of Athens or heroes of Attic legend. To these were added later three foreign benefactors of the Athenian state, Attalus, Ptolemy, and Hadrian. Beyond these were other statues, including that of Peace carrying the infant Wealth, the well-

known work of Cephisodotus, of which copies still survive. Here were also portraits of famous men: Lycurgus, who did so much for the administration of Athens and the completion of its buildings; Callias, who was said to have made the peace with Persia in the fifth century on conditions very satisfactory to the Greeks; and Demosthenes. Near to the statue of Demosthenes, which may have been the original of the statues of the orator that have survived, and close under the rocky brow of the Areopagus, was the temple of Ares, with statues inside it of the god himself by Alcamenes, of Aphrodite and of Athena, and of Enyo by the sons of Praxiteles. Outside the temple were other statues, including one of Pindar, whose praise of Athens gained him many honours from the Athenian people. Not far from this were the statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton, placed at the highest corner of the Agora, where the steep path ascended to the saddle between Areopagus and Acropolis, and so to the Propylæa. Pausanias saw here not only the statues made by Critius and Nesiotes after the Persian invasion, but also the earlier group by Antenor, which Xerxes had carried off to Persia, and which Alexander had sent back to stand in its old place. These vigorous works of early Attic sculpture served at once as a monument of the adopted heroes of Athenian democracy, and as a trophy of the final triumph of Greece over Persia. The place where they stood, which was sometimes called the Orchestra, was where the first plays of the Attic drama had been per-

formed by Thespis, before the theatre south of the Acropolis was used; it was the highest point of the Agora, and when he has reached it, Pausanias breaks off his perambulation to continue it elsewhere.

The next thing which he describes is a group of buildings situated outside the Agora—how far off is a disputed question. First of these is the Odeum—not that built by Pericles close to the Theatre of Dionysus, nor that of Herodes Atticus, which was not yet built when Pausanias visited Athens, but a different building, of which the position is not otherwise recorded. Nor have we any evidence to show, in other cases where the Odeum is mentioned without further definition, whether this Odeum or the Odeum of Pericles is meant; from its name it must have been a theatre-like building intended for musical contests and performances. In front of it were statues of the Ptolemies and of Pyrrhus, and within it a notable statue of Dionysus. Near it was the fountain Enneacrunus, or the Nine Spouts, so called from its decoration by Pisistratus, the only running spring of water in the whole city. Above the spring were the temples of Demeter and Kore and of Triptolemus, and in front of the temple of Triptolemus a seated statue of Epimenides of Crete, who was said to have stayed a pestilence at Athens by purifying the city when it was polluted by the murder of Cylon. We know from other sources that there were two well-known precincts of Demeter in Athens—the one just below the Acropolis, where the mystæ met together be-

fore the procession to Eleusis at the Greater Mysteries, and another in the suburb of Agræ, just beyond the Ilissus, where the Lesser Mysteries were celebrated. Pausanias was prevented by a dream from going into more details as to the Athenian Eleusinium, else he might have explained the relation of the two shrines, and have told us, at least, which of the two was the one he had come to in his walk round Athens. If he had gone far away from the Agora to the fountain Enneacrunus in the Ilissus, then the temple of Demeter above it must have been the one in Agræ. A little farther away was the temple of Eucleia, or Fame, dedicated in memory of the victory over the Persians at Marathon; an appropriate record of the most glorious exploit in Athenian history¹ — a battle so famous that Æschylus chose to record on his tomb that he had fought in it, rather than to make any reference to his plays.

Pausanias now returns to the neighbourhood of the Agora, and he next mentions the buildings on the low hill above it on its west side, behind the Stoa Basileios. Here he saw a temple of Hephæstus, with statues of Hephæstus and Athena; the goddess was represented with sea-blue eyes, like those usually given to Posidon. Near this temple was another, dedicated to the Heavenly Aphrodite, with a statue by Phidias.² He must also have

¹ This is evidently how Pausanias takes it, from his tale of Æschylus. He evidently knows nothing of an Artemis Eucleia, or association with the Agora.

² See p. 395.

seen, on this hill, the temple we now know as the The-
seum; but unless it be identified with one of the two
just mentioned, we must suppose it was among those
that he either failed to note, or excised in his revision,
perhaps because it contained nothing that especially in-
terested him. He then descended again into the Agora,
and went across it, either to its west or north side,
passing on his way the triumphal arch set up by the
Athenians for their victory over Cassander,¹ and the
bronze statue of Hermes Agoraios. Thus he came to
the famous Stoa Pœcile (or Painted Stoa), with its
pictures by Polygnotus and others of mythical and
real battles, above all that of Marathon,—a building
full of the most splendid associations of patriotism and
military prowess, and also among the most frequented in
the Agora. Here too were some shields dedicated; and
some of them, protected by a coat of pitch from the rav-
ages of time, were said to be those of the Spartans cap-
tured at Sphacteria. Pausanias does not, however, mention
another memory, perhaps the most familiar of all attached
to the Stoa—that of Zeno, and the Stoic School founded
by his teaching in this portico. In front of the Stoa
were statues, including that of Solon, and farther on, one
of Seleucus. In the Agora stood an altar of Pity or of
Mercy (Ἐλεος), a curious instance both of sentiment and
of impersonation, which impressed the later Greeks as it
has some modern writers.

Pausanias now left the Agora, omitting, curiously

¹ See p. 481.

enough, to mention the fine Stoa of Attalus, and went on to see some of the buildings situated in the space to the east of it, and to the north of the Acropolis. On the level ground was the fine Gymnasium built by Ptolemy, with statues in it, one of Ptolemy himself, and one of the philosopher Chrysippus. Close to this Gymnasium was the Theseum — not the temple we now call by that name, but a shrine built by Cimon to contain the bones of Theseus when he brought them from Scyros; it was decorated by Micon with paintings relating to the exploits of the hero. Pausanias then turned toward the slope of the Acropolis, and visited the temple of the Dioscuri, also decorated with paintings by Micon. The precinct of this temple was a convenient place for large meetings; for it was here that Pisistratus had called the citizens together, on the occasion when he tricked them out of their arms by gathering them into the gateway to hear him, while his attendants, left behind for the purpose, gathered up their arms and carried them up to the neighbouring precinct of Aglauros. The precinct of Aglauros, best known as the place where the youths of Athens took their oaths on being admitted to the ranks of the ephebi, or cadets, was also associated with the death of the daughters of Cecrops, Aglauros and Herse, who hurled themselves from the rocks of the Acropolis, when their sister Pandrosos, whose precinct lay just above on the Acropolis, remained faithful to her trust; but they opened the box intrusted to them by Athena, with the snake-child Erich-

thonius in it, and their presumption was visited with madness. This precinct of Aglauros must therefore have lain just under the Acropolis rock, below the western end of the Erechtheum; and beside it was the cleft by which the Persians climbed up when they captured the Acropolis and slew its defenders. A little farther to the east, but still close to the Acropolis, was the Prytaneum, with the ancient wooden copies of the laws of Solon, and statues of Peace and of Hestia, the goddess of the common Hearth, in whose honour the banquets of the Prytaneum were held; there, too, were statues of Miltiades and Themistocles, both of them, according to the practice denounced by Cicero, bearing other names inscribed in Roman times.

From the Prytaneum, which must have been just below the Acropolis, about the middle of its north side, two ways diverged. The one of these kept close under the slope of the hill, and led round to the Theatre of Dionysus; the other took a wide sweep through the level ground, first to the north and then to the east, and so led to the Olympieum. Pausanias followed first this latter road; it led him, on the way down, past the temple of Sarapis, and, not far from it, the place where Theseus and Pirithous made their covenant with one another; the pledges they gave each other on this occasion seem to have been still preserved and shown on this spot; near was a temple of Ilithyia, with some ancient images of the goddess, enveloped in drapery down to the feet. It must have been a long distance — nearly half a mile — from

here to the Olympieum; but Pausanias mentions nothing on the way. The colossal temple of the Olympian Zeus had recently been completed by Hadrian at the time of Pausanias' visit; he was impressed by the great size of the statue; it seems to have exceeded its original at Olympia in this respect, and to have been only surpassed by the colossi at Rhodes and in Rome. There were, outside the temple, and in front of its columns, bronze statues emblematic of the various colonies of Athens, and an immense number of statues of Hadrian, some set up by the Athenians, others by different Greek cities. There were however within the precinct other objects of greater interest and of ancient sanctity. Among these were an ancient bronze statue of Zeus, a temple of Cronos and Rhea, and a precinct of Olympian Ge (Earth). Here was shown a chasm in the earth about a cubit wide, down which the waters of Deucalion's flood are said to have subsided. Here every year they threw in cakes of wheaten meal and honey. In this region, too, was the tomb of Deucalion. There was also a statue of Isocrates, set up on a column. Passing on beyond the temple of the Olympian Zeus, Pausanias saw the statue of Apollo Pythius, which must have been in the Pythium, a shrine in which several inscriptions, including one altar dedicated by the younger Pisistratus and mentioned by Thucydides, have actually been found close to the Ilissus, below the spring Callirrhoe (or Enneacrunus). In this connection Pausanias mentions also a temple of Apollo Delphinus, which may or may not

have been close by. Here, too, perhaps a little higher up the river, where there are gardens to the present day, was the district called the Gardens, and the temple of Aphrodite famous for its statue by Alcamenes. The next building mentioned by Pausanias is the sanctuary of Heracles, called Cynosarges, with altars of Heracles and Hebe, his bride, as well as of his mother, Alcmena, and his companion, Iolaus; the Cynosarges is chiefly known for its gymnasium, and also from the fact that the Athenians halted there on their return from Marathon to protect Athens against the attack of the Persians who had gone round by sea. It was probably situated on the slope of Lycabettus, not far from the place where the British and American schools are now built. The position has a commanding view over the sea, and therefore would form a suitable camp for an army prepared to resist a landing. This seems to have been the extreme point reached by Pausanias to the north-east. He next saw the Lyceum, sacred to Apollo, and famous for its gymnasium and garden, which were frequented by Aristotle and his peripatetic disciples. Behind this was the tomb of Nisus of Megara, whose daughter betrayed him out of love to Minos. Pausanias then went down to the valley of the Ilissus, which he had already approached before at the Pythium, and perhaps also at Enneacrunus; and he saw the place where Boreas was said to have seized Orithyia, and the altar of the Ilissian Muses, the very places described by Plato as a setting to the dialogue of the

Phædrus. Here, too, was the place where Codrus fell when he sacrificed himself for Athens and went out in disguise to be slain by the Spartan invaders; his shrine, associated with those of Neleus and Basile, was a little farther along, below the Theatre of Dionysus. Beyond the Ilissus was the suburb of Agraë, which we have already noticed as connected with the celebration of the lesser Mysteries. In Agraë also was the temple of Artemis Agrotera, of which the position is now uncertain, and also another structure that still remains, the Panathenaic Stadium, fresh in the time of Pausanias from its lavish decoration with Pentelic marble by Herodes Atticus.

Pausanias now retraces his steps to the Prytaneum, and takes the other road, close beneath the slope of the Acropolis, called that of the Tripods. Here he saw many little shrines, of which one only, the monument of Lysicrates, has survived until the present day; these shrines were especially built to support the votive tripods that had been given for prizes in the choric and dramatic contests. These little monuments were especially famous for the works of art they contained, among them being the famous Satyr of Praxiteles. Pausanias then visited the precinct of Dionysus below the Theatre, with its two temples, its gold and ivory statue by Alcamenes, and its paintings; then he went back in the direction he had come from, to notice the Odeum of Pericles, which, though burnt in the time of Sulla, had been restored in its original form, said to have been

imitated from the tent of Xerxes. In the Theatre, he saw the statues of tragic and comic poets; and, on the south wall of the Acropolis above it, a gilt head of Medusa set on an ægis. At the top of the Theatre he saw the cave, and the tripod dedicated by Thrasyllus above it, with a representation of Apollo and Artemis slaying the children of Niobe. Then passing on toward the entrance of the Acropolis, he saw the grave of Calos, who was said to have been the nephew and apprentice of Dædalus; his uncle hurled him down from the rocks of the Acropolis in jealousy of his superior inventions. Next to this was the Asclepieum, with its numerous votive offerings and images of the god and his children, and the old sacred spring, beside which Halirrhothius, son of Posidon, was said to have offered violence to Alcippe, the daughter of Ares; and Ares, who consequently slew him, underwent the first trial for homicide at the Areopagus. Beyond the Asclepieum was the temple of Themis, and in front of it a mound, the tomb of Hippolytus. Here also was the temple of Aphrodite Pandemos, and also of Earth, the nurse of children (*κουροτρόφος*), and of Demeter Chloe. Both of these last shrines were on the immediate ascent to the Acropolis. Pausanias does not mention the Odeum of Herodes in his description of Athens, because, as he explains later on in his history, it was not built until after his visit.

Pausanias next enters the Acropolis, but we need not follow his description of it, because we have already tried to realise the appearance of the Acropolis, with its various

temples, and votive offerings, at the close of the fifth century; and, but for the addition of a few monuments that have been sufficiently noticed elsewhere, there was not much change in the Acropolis between that date and the visit of Pausanias. We may therefore infer that he saw on the Acropolis what has already been described in Chapter VI., and accompany him again as he descends from the Propylæa. Here he noticed, on his way down, the spring Clepsydra, and the caves of Apollo and Pan. Then he saw the Areopagus, with its altar of Athena Areia dedicated by Orestes when he was acquitted by the court; the temple of Ares he had already noticed on the opposite slope of the hill near the Agora. On the top of the hill, probably where the court used to sit in old times, were the stones of Hybris (Violence) and Anaideia (Ruthlessness), assigned respectively to the accused and the accuser. Near below, round the chasm that may still be seen, was the precinct of the Holy Ones, the Erinnyes, who had to be propitiated by all who were acquitted by the court. In this were statues of the goddesses themselves, but in no terrible form, and also of Hermes and Earth and Pluto; here, too, was the tomb of Œdipus, associated with the famous play of Sophocles. Pausanias, however, was not satisfied until he had reconciled this account with that of Homer, by finding a tradition that the bones of Œdipus had been brought from Thebes. Near to the Areopagus, too, was the sacred ship which carried the peplos of Athena in the Panathenaic procession — probably the elaborate machine made

by Herodes Atticus for his gorgeous celebration of the festival, when it seemed to move along of its own accord by means of mechanism concealed within itself. This ship of Herodes is indeed said by Philostratus to have been preserved near the Pythium; but, being movable, it need not always have been kept in the same place. A ship, though not such an elaborate one, had been used in the Panathenaic procession regularly in earlier times.

From the Areopagus, Pausanias returns to the Dipylon Gate, and notices the tombs on the way to the Academy, especially those of the Athenians who fell in battle and were here buried, as Thucydides says, in the most beautiful suburb of the town. Here, too, was a small temple of Dionysus, to which the statue of the god was carried in an annual procession. In the Academy was an altar of Prometheus, which was the starting-point of a torch race to the city; not far off was the tomb of Plato, and the gymnasium and garden which still preserved his memory. Near by was the tower of Timon the misanthrope, who seems to have chosen a much frequented region for his seclusion. Farther to the east was Colonus Hippius, the scene of the *Œdipus at Colonus*, with its altar of Athena and Posidon, and a shrine of Theseus and Pirithous, and one of Œdipus and Adrastus. Pausanias mentions that the grove of Posidon and his temple had been burnt by Antigonus in his invasion, and perhaps it never recovered from this disaster. Certainly the modern traveller will look as vainly as

Pausanias for the groves and the nightingales celebrated by Sophocles.

Here we must take leave of our guide; if we have, now and then, had some doubts as to the exact route by which he led us, and regret that he has not given us more exact topographical indications, we must, on the whole, be grateful to him for a careful and honest account of what he saw. He wrote, in the first place, for his contemporaries, not for posterity; and even if he had realised the value which his book would have for us at the present day, he could not have foretold what monuments or buildings would survive and be easily identified, what would either be totally destroyed or if they remained would be a bone of contention among archaeologists. It is an unkind fate that has preserved the Theseum with no clear evidence for its identification, and the Tower of the Winds, which Pausanias does not mention, while it has destroyed or hidden beneath deep accumulations of soil most of the temples and porticoes which he describes. For this result his methods are not to blame; we must rather acknowledge that we are indebted to his book for a clearer and completer picture of Athens than we could have hoped to realise without his help, or than we might have inferred from the descriptions of a more brilliant but less conscientious author.

NOTE XIII *a*

ON THE ROUTE OF PAUSANIAS

The question of the route followed by Pausanias in his walk through Athens is a very complicated one ; a brief summary of this route¹ will show the chief points of doubt or difficulty. He starts from the Dipylon Gate, and, after proceeding to the Agora, describes the buildings that lie on his right, beginning with the Stoa Basileios ; the position of each building relative to the one preceding it is stated in every case till he comes to the Tyrannicides, whom we know from independent information to have stood in a place called the Orchestra, by the ascent to the Acropolis, but still in the Agora. Next he mentions a group of buildings all close together, and just above the fountain Enneacrunus ; this group of buildings offers the chief difficulty, but the difficulty cannot be discussed until we have the rest of Pausanias' route clearly in our minds. He then speaks of the temple of Hephæstus and other buildings above the Ceramicus or Agora and the Stoa Basileios ; he mentions a statue and a gate on the way to the Painted Stoa, and after describing this Stoa in detail, quotes the altar of Pity in the Agora. Then come two buildings near together, not far off the Agora, the Theseum and the Gymnasium of Ptolemy ; there is no indication of the local relation of these two to the next group, again close together, and including the Precinct of Agraulos (of which the site is known) and the Prytaneum. From the Prytaneum he follows first a road which takes him in a wide sweep to the east through the lower town to the Olympieum and the Ilissus ; he returns to the Prytaneum and follows the Street of Tripods close under the east of the Acropolis to the Theatre, along the south side of the Acropolis and so up to the Propylæa. He then describes the Acropolis : on his way down he notices the Clepsydra and the caves of Apollo and Pan, and then the Areopagus and objects round it. After this he leaves the city and proceeds to the suburbs, beginning with the Academy.

With the exception of the difficulty we have reserved, there are in the whole of this description only two deviations from a consistent topographical order ; after the Olympieum Pausanias quotes other

¹ See Note XIII *b*.

buildings erected by Hadrian at Athens ; and after the Areopagus he mentions other law-courts ; but in both cases the connection of subject is obvious, and there is little danger of any consequent misunderstanding. But in the case of the Enneacrunus and the buildings that adjoin it, if there be a similar deviation from topographical order, there certainly is a danger of misunderstanding ; for these buildings offer no very close connection of subject with one another or with the fountain, nor is there any obvious reason for their insertion at this point, unless they come into the actual topographical sequence. In order to understand the problem, it is necessary to realise clearly where they are inserted. Pausanias has just finished describing the buildings on the right hand or western side of the Agora, ending with the Tyrannicides, which stood by the ascent to the Acropolis ; he then mentions the Odeum and other buildings near the Enneacrunus ; and after that he returns immediately to mention two buildings that lie above those he has mentioned on the right hand of the Agora, before crossing the Agora and speaking of those that lay on its other side. Now it is generally admitted that the north end of the Agora, which Pausanias first reached, lay just to the east of the low hill on which the Theseum now stands ; the Tyrannicides, who mark the other end of the Agora, have been variously placed either at the eastern or the western end of the Areopagus, and the position and extent of the Agora depends on the position assigned to its two ends. I think the mention of the ascent to the Acropolis (*ἣ ἀνιμεν ἐς πόλιν*) can only apply to the ascent between Areopagus and Acropolis, for the road which skirts the foot of the Pnyx Hill does not really begin to ascend the Acropolis until the zigzag way branches off near the Odeum of Herodes. However, we must admit both alternatives to consideration. Whichever we accept, the fact remains that Pausanias interpolates among the descriptions of other buildings that lie close together around the Agora, the mention of the Odeum, Enneacrunus, and the temple of Demeter and the Eleusinium. Three explanations of this fact have been suggested —

(1) that of Leake, Curtius, and others, who, holding that Enneacrunus was certainly in the bed of the Ilissus, believe that it and the other buildings mentioned with it are inserted here for some reason out of topographical order.

(2) that of Wachsmuth, Frazer, and others, who agree with Leake as to the position of Enneacrunus, but cannot accept so great a deviation from topographical order in Pausanias' description; they therefore think Pausanias must have seen or been shown some other spring close to the end of the Agora, which he mistook for Enneacrunus.

(3) that of Dörpfeld, who insists on the topographical order, and accepts this passage as evidence that Enneacrunus really was near the end of the Agora; consequently he made excavations to look for it, and found what he believes to be Enneacrunus just under the Pnyx Hill.

Each of these explanations requires careful criticism. (1) The evidence of other writers is, as we have seen, extremely strong in favour of the position of Enneacrunus near the Ilissus. In order to explain the deviation from topographical sequence, Curtius suggests that Pausanias actually went with his first guide as far as the Tyrannicides; that he took next a guide initiated into the Mysteries, to show him round the Eleusinium, the temple of Demeter, and the adjoining buildings, before completing the circuit of the Agora; and that this more or less fortuitous sequence has penetrated from his diary into his book. Leake suggests that the long gap between the Tyrannicides and the buildings round Enneacrunus was perhaps partly filled in Pausanias' notes by other things which he discarded in the selection of which he speaks. The case is not much more extreme than when he passes from the Prytaneum, below the north of the Acropolis, to the Olympieum on the Ilissus, mentioning only two or three things on the way; and then returns to the Prytaneum, to take a fresh start along the Street of the Tripods. But there is this difference, that the excursion to the Olympieum takes Pausanias to places which he would otherwise have missed, while that to the Enneacrunus takes him to the region by the Ilissus, which he visits again later on. An extreme version of the first theory is the practical, if cynical, suggestion of a modern writer of guide-books, who sees "considerable difficulty in questioning the liberty of a traveller, who lived seventeen centuries ago, to return home periodically for the purpose of dining or sleeping, and begin his work at a fresh point after an interval of repose."¹

¹ Murray, *Greece*, p. 288.

(2) The second explanation has the great advantage of preserving the topographical sequence of Pausanias without rejecting the clear evidence of other writers ; but the supposition that Pausanias mistook some other fountain in or near the Agora for Enneacrunus is extremely improbable, especially when we consider the words in which he describes the fountain as the only one in Athens, and his evident reminiscence of Thucydides. To accept this explanation is a counsel of despair ; yet Mr. Frazer, after a most careful and judicial weighing of all the evidence, finds himself forced to it. But even so, all difficulties are not removed. If the fountain be the one of which some trace existed in the eighteenth century close to the cave of the Semnæ, there is very little room in this region for the Odeum, and the temple of Demeter, and the other buildings mentioned ; if it be the one found by Professor Dörpfeld by the Pnyx Hill, there are still the topographical difficulties mentioned under (3).

(3) So far as Pausanias himself is concerned, Professor Dörpfeld's explanation is certainly the simplest and easiest, though not free from all difficulties. For, if we place the statues of the Tyrannicides, as he does, near the western end of the Areopagus, there is still a distance of about two hundred yards from thence to the Enneacrunus, while from the eastern end of the Areopagus the distance is about a quarter of a mile. This distance is, indeed, much less than the distance to the Enneacrunus in the Ilissus, which is more than half a mile away ; but still it breaks the direct sequence of the buildings surrounding the Agora, and takes us into a new region, which Pausanias approaches later when speaking of the Areopagus. If it be claimed for Professor Dörpfeld's theory that it has stood the scientific test of experiment, since he stated beforehand that he expected to find the Enneacrunus, and now has actually found a fountain corresponding to his prediction, this claim must be allowed, — but with the reservation that the fountain has been found some distance from where he first sought it, and that this interval is all in the direction away from the Agora, while no trace has been found of the other buildings mentioned by Pausanias as lying near the Enneacrunus. However, if we had no evidence but that of Pausanias as to the position of Enneacrunus, there is little doubt that all topographers would agree in accepting Professor Dörp-


feld's view as the most probable. The great objection to that view lies in the difficulty of reconciling it with the evidence of other writers as to the position of Enneacrunus by the Ilissus; and although Professor Dörpfeld explains all this other evidence away, the majority of scholars agree that it cannot be so disposed of, and that it carries too great weight to be ignored.


From this brief discussion it appears that there are serious difficulties in the way of each of the three explanations that have been suggested, and that we are practically reduced to weighing the objections in each case, and choosing what seems the least improbable on the evidence that lies before us. Each of the three theories has found advocates whose opinions are entitled to the highest respect, and it is certainly open to any one to hold any of the three without the possibility of a dogmatic assertion that he is wrong. In the present chapter it has been necessary to adopt one view to the exclusion of the other two; but, in accepting the first as being, in my opinion, the most in accordance with all the available evidence, it is without any dogmatic assertion of its certainty; a very little new evidence might turn the scale toward either of the other two hypotheses, and such evidence may come to light any day.

NOTE XIII *b*.

TOPOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY OF THE ROUTE OF PAUSANIAS

References to Chapters and Sections in Pausanias.	Numbers as given on plan of Athens.
I. 2. 4. Ἑσελθόντων ἐς τὴν πόλιν, building for processions	1
πλησίον, temple of Demeter	2
from gate to Ceramicus, stoæ	3
5. one of stoæ has ἱερὰ θεῶν	4
it has also Gymnasium of Hermes	5
there is in it House of Pulytion, now sacred to Dionysus	6
ἐνταῦθα, dedication of Eubulides	7
μετὰ δὲ τὸ Διονύσου τέμενος, house with clay images	8
3. 1. Ceramicus.	
πρώτη ἐν δεξιά, Stoa Basileios	9
πλησίον, statues of Conon and Evagoras	10
ἐνταῦθα, Zeus Eleutherios	11





EXPLANATION OF NUMBERS REFERRING TO ROUTE OF PAUSANIAS

(See Note XIII. p. 538)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Pompeum. | 45. Meeting-place of Theseus and Pirithous. |
| 2. Temple of Demeter. | 46. Temple of Ilithyia. |
| 3. Porticoes. | 47. Statues of Hadrian. |
| 4. Sanctuaries of various gods. | 48. Precinct of Zeus Olympius. |
| 5. Gymnasium of Hermes. | 49. Pythium. |
| 6. House of Polytion. | 50. Sanctuary of Apollo Delphinus. |
| 7. Dedication of Eubalides. | 51. Gardens. |
| 8. House with clay images. | 52. Temple of Aphrodite. |
| 9. Stoa Basilicos. | 53. Statue of Aphrodite. |
| 10. Statues of Conon and Evagoras. | 54. Cynosarges. |
| 11. Zeus Eleuthereus. | 55. Lyceum. |
| 12. Stoa with paintings by Euphapor. | 56. Monument of Nisus. |
| 13. Temple of Apollo Patrous. | 57. Ilissus. |
| 14. Statues by Leochares and Calamis. | 58. Place where Boreas seized Orithyia. |
| 15. Metroum. | 59. Altar of Ilissian Muses. |
| 16. Buleuterium. | 60. Place where Codrus fell. |
| 17. Tholus. | 61. Agræ. |
| 18. Statues of Eponymi. | 62. Temple of Artemis Agrotera. |
| 19. Group of statues, one of Demosthenes. | 63. Stadium. |
| 20. Temple of Area. | 64. Street of the Tripods. |
| 21. Pindar, and other statues. | 65. Works of art in Street of Tripods. |
| 22. Harmodius and Aristogiton. | 66. Satyr and Dionysus in temple. |
| 23. Odeum. | 67. Sanctuary of Dionysus beside the Theatre. |
| 24. Statues of Egyptian kings. | 68. Odeum of Pericles. |
| 25. Statue of Pyrrhus. | 69. Gorgoneion on wall of Acropolis. |
| 26. Enneacrurnus. | 70. Cave with monument of Thrasyllus. |
| 27. Temples of Demeter and Triptolemus. | 71. Grave of Calos. |
| 28. Statue of Epimenides. | 72. Sanctuary of Asclepius. |
| 29. Temple of Eucleia. | 73. Spring. |
| 30. Temple of Hephæstus. | 74. Temple of Themis. |
| 31. Temple of Aphrodite Urania. | 75. Tamulus to Hippolytus. |
| 32. Hermes Agoraios. | 76. Temple of Aphrodite Pandemos. |
| 33. Triumphal Arch. | 77. Ge Kouroutrophos. |
| 34. Stoa Pocile. | 78. Demeter Chloe. |
| 35. Statues, one of Solon. | 79. Clepsydra. |
| 36. Seleneum. | 80. Caves of Apollo and Pan. |
| 37. Altar of Pity. | 81. Areopagus. |
| 38. Gymnasium of Eulemy. | 82. Altar of Athena Areia. |
| 39. Thesæum. | 83. Stones of Hybris and Androia. |
| 40. Sanctuary of Dionysus. | 84. Sanctuary of Semæ. |
| 41. Precinct of Aglauros. | 85. Monument of Edipus. |
| 42. Ascent of Persians. | 86. Panathenæic Ship. |
| 43. Prytaneum. | |
| 44. Sanctuary of Serapis. | |

Notes on the Route of Pausanias. Persons show the way on Acropolis.

LIST OF NUMBERS REFERRING TO ROUTE OF PAUSANIAS

(see Note XIII & p. 238)

45. Meeting-place of Theseus and Pirithous.	1. Tomb of Demeter.
46. Temple of Minerva.	2. Temple of Demeter.
47. Statue of Heracles.	3. Porticoes.
48. Precinct of Zeus Olympius.	4. Sanctuaries of various gods.
49. Pythium.	5. Gymnasium of Heracles.
50. Sanctuary of Apollo Delphinus.	6. House of Polydorus.
51. Gardens.	7. Dedication of Eubulides.
52. Temple of Aphrodite.	8. House with clay images.
53. Statue of Aphrodite.	9. Stoa Basilica.
54. Gymnasium.	10. Statue of Cimon and Eucorides.
55. Lycium.	11. Zeus Eleuthereus.
56. Monument of Nicias.	12. Stoa with paintings by Euphranor.
57. Illius.	13. Temple of Apollo Patrons.
58. Place where Boreas seized Orithyia.	14. Statue by Leochares and Calamis.
59. Altar of Iliadon Muses.	15. Metron.
60. Place where Codrus fell.	16. Paleutrium.
61. Agre.	17. Tholos.
62. Temple of Artemis Agrotera.	18. Statue of Epopymi.
63. Stadium.	19. Group of statues, one of Demos-thenes.
64. Street of the Tribos.	20. Temple of Ares.
65. Works of art in street of Tribos.	21. Lindar, and other statues.
66. Sate and Dionysus in temple.	22. Parnonius and Aristogiton.
67. Sanctuary of Dionysus beside the Theatre.	23. Gymnasium.
68. Odeum of Pericles.	24. Statue of Ptolemy king.
69. Gorgoneion on wall of Acropolis.	25. Statue of Ptolemy.
70. Cave with monument of Phaedrus.	26. Funerarium.
71. Grave of Calos.	27. Temple of Demeter and Triptolemus.
72. Sanctuary of Asclepius.	28. Statue of Epimenides.
73. Spring.	29. Temple of Eros.
74. Temple of Themis.	30. Temple of Hephaestus.
75. Tumulus to Hippolytus.	31. Temple of Aphrodite Urania.
76. Temple of Aphrodite Pandemos.	32. Heracles Agorae.
77. The Komatrophos.	33. Triumphal Arch.
78. Demeter (Phoe).	34. Stoa Procla.
79. (Ephesus).	35. Statue, one of Solon.
80. (Cave of Apollo and Pan).	36. Stoa.
81. (Cave of Apollo and Pan).	37. Altar of Hera.
82. Areopagus.	38. Gymnasium of Ptolemy.
83. Altar of Athena Areia.	39. Theatrum.
84. Stones of Hybris and Anankia.	40. Sanctuary of Iphigeneia.
85. Sanctuary of Nemesis.	41. Precinct of Agorae.
86. Monument of Epicharmus.	42. Ascent of Festus.
87. Panathenaic Ship.	43. Pythium.
	44. Sanctuary of Hera.

2.	stoa ὀπισθεν, with paintings, by Euphranor	12
3.	statue by Euphranor πλησίον ἐν τῷ ναῷ, Apollo Patrous	13
	πρὸ τοῦ νεῶ, statues by Leochares and Calamis	14
4.	Μητρὸς θεῶν ἱερὸν	15
	πλησίον, Buleuterium of 500	16
	(Digression on Gauls.)	
5. 1.	πλησίον τοῦ βουλευτηρίου, Tholus	17
	ἀνωτέρω, statues of Eponymi	18
	(Digression on Attalus and Ptolemy.)	
8. 3.	μετὰ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἐπωνύμων, statues, including Eirene and Plutus, Lycurgus, Callias, Demosthenes	19
5.	τῆς τοῦ Δημοσθένους εἰκόνης πλησίον, temple of Ares	20
	περὶ τὸν ναόν, statues, including Pindar	21
	οὐ πόρρω δὲ Harmodius and Aristogiton	22
	theatre called Odeum	23
6.	πρὸ τῆς ἐσόδου, statues of Egyptian kings	24
	(Digression on Ptolemies.)	
11. 1.	Ἀθηναίους δὲ εἰκὼν ἔστι καὶ Πύρρου	25
	(Digression on Pyrrhus.)	
14. 1.	inside Odeum, Dionysus. πλησίον δὲ ἔστι κρήνη, Enneacrunus	26
1.	ὑπὲρ τὴν κρήνην, temples of Demeter and Triptolemus	27
3.	πρὸ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦδε ἐνθά καὶ τοῦ Τριπτολέμου τὸ ἀγαλμα, bronze bull and Epimenides	28
4.	ἐπὶ ἀπωτέρω, temple of Eucleia	29
5.	ὑπὲρ τὸν κεραμεικὸν καὶ στοὰν . . . βασιλείον, temple of Hephæstus	30
6.	πλησίον, temple of Aphrodite Urania	31
15. 1.	Ἴοῦσι πρὸς τὴν στοὰν ἣν Ποικίλην ὀνομάζουσιν, Hermes Agoraios	32
	καὶ πύλη πλησίον	33
2.	paintings in Stoa Poecile	34
16. 1.	statues πρὸ μὲν τῆς στοᾶς, Solon	35
	ὀλίγον δὲ ἀπωτέρω, Seleucus	36
17. 1.	ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ, among other things, altar of Pity	37
2.	in Gymnasium of Ptolemy, τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἀπέχοντι οὐ πολὺ, statues πρὸς τῷ γυμνασίῳ, hieron of Theseus (σηκὸς)	38
	39	
18. 1.	hieron of Dioscuri	40
2.	ὑπὲρ τῶν Διοσκούρων τὸ ἱερὸν, precinct of Aglauros	41
	κατὰ τοῦτο ἐπαναβάντες Persians slew those on Acropolis	42
3.	πλησίον Prytaneum	43

4.	έντεῦθεν ἰοῦσιν εἰς τὰ κάτω τῆς πόλεως, hieron of Sarapis	44
	οὐ πόρρω, place of agreement of Theseus and Pirithous	45
5.	πλησίον, temple of Ilithyia	46
6.	πρὶν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἰέναι τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου, statues of Hadrian	47
	περίβολος of Zeus Olympius	48
18. 9.	(Digression ; other buildings of Hadrian in Athens.)	
19. 1.	μετὰ τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου, statue of Apollo Pythius	49
	ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλο ἱερὸν of Apollo Delphinus	50
2.	Gardens	51
2.	temple of Aphrodite	52
	Aphrodite πλησίον τοῦ ναοῦ	53
3.	Hieron of Heracles called Cynosarges	54
4.	Lyceum	55
5.	ὑπὸ τοῦ Λυκείου, monument of Nisus	56
6.	rivers of Athens, Ilissus (Eridanus flowing into it)	57
	ὁ δὲ Ἰλισσὸς οὗτος ἐνθα Boreas seized Orithyia	58
	ἐπ' αὐτῷ, altar of Ilissian Muses	59
	δείκνυται δὲ καὶ ἐνθα Codrus was killed	60
7.	διαβᾶσι τὸν Ἰλισόν, Agræ	61
	temple of Artemis Agrotera	62
	Stadium	63
20. 1.	ἀπὸ τοῦ Πρυτανείου, street called Tripods,	64
	and works of art in it, including satyr of Praxiteles	65
	ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῷ πλησίον, satyr and Dionysus	66
2.	πρὸς τῷ θεάτρῳ, oldest hieron of Dionysus, and two temples in it	67
3.	πλησίον τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ τοῦ θεάτρου, erection in imitation of Xerxes' tent (Odeum of Pericles)	68
	(Digression on Sulla's capture of Athens.)	
21. 1.	ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, statues of poets.	
4.	ἐπὶ τοῦ νοτίου λεγομένου τείχους, ὃ ἐς τὸ θεάτρὸν ἐστι τετραμήνον, Medusa's head on ægis	69
5.	ἐν τῇ κορυφῇ τοῦ θεατροῦ, cave (monument of Thrasyllus)	70
6.	Ἰόντων ἐς τὴν Ἀκρόπολιν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεάτρου, grave of Calos	71
7.	hieron of Asclepius	72
	ἐν αὐτῷ, spring	73
22. 1.	μετὰ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀσκληπίου ταύτῃ πρὸς τὴν Ἀκρόπολιν ἰοῦσι, temple of Themis	74
	πρὸ αὐτοῦ, tumulus to Hippolytus	75

3.	Aphrodite Pandemos	76
	hieron of Ge Kourotrophos	77
	hieron of Demeter Chloe	78
4.	entrance to Acropolis. (Description of Acropolis.)	
28. 4.	καταβᾶσι οὐκ ἐς τὴν κάτω πόλιν, ἀλλ' ὅσον ὑπὸ τὰ Προπύλαια, spring (Clepsydra)	79
	πλησίον, hieron of Apollo in cave	80
	(Pan)	81
5.	Areopagus	82
	altar of Athena Areia	83
	rough stones, of Hybris and Anaideia	84
6.	πλησίον, hieron of Semnæ	85
7.	ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου, monument of Œdipus	86
	(Digression on law courts.)	
29. 1.	τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου πλησίον, Panathenaic ship	87
	(On to ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, Academy, etc.).	

CHAPTER XIV

THE PIRÆUS


Ἐπεισε δὲ καὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς τὰ λοιπὰ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς οἰκοδομεῖν (ὑπῆρκετο δὲ αὐτοῦ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ἀρχῆς, ἥς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Ἀθηναῖοις ἤρξε) νομίζων τὸ χωρίον καλὸν εἶναι, λιμένας ἔχον τρεῖς αὐτοφυεῖς.

—Thuc. I. 93. 3.

ὁ δὲ Πειραιεὺς δῆμος μὲν ἦν ἐκ παλαιού, πρότερον δὲ πρὶν ἢ Θεμιστοκλῆς Ἀθηναίους ἤρξεν ἐπίνειον οὐκ ἦν· Φάληρον δὲ, ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐλάχιστον ἀπέχει τῆς πόλεως ἢ θάλασσα, τοῦτό σφισιν ἐπίνειον ἦν, καὶ Μενεσθέα φασὶν αὐτόθεν ταῖς ναυσὶν εἰς Τροίαν ἀναχθῆναι, καὶ τούτου πρότερον Θησέα δώσοντα Μίνω δίκας τῆς Ἀνδρόγεω τελευτῆς. Θεμιστοκλῆς δὲ ὡς ἤρξε (ταῖς τε γὰρ πλείουσιν ἐπιτηδειότερος ὁ Πειραιεὺς ἐφαίνετό οἱ προκεῖσθαι καὶ λιμένας τρεῖς ἀνθ' ἑνὸς ἔχειν τοῦ Φαληροῦ) τοῦτό σφισιν ἐπίνειον εἶναι κατεσκενάσατο.

—Paus. I. 1. 2.

WHILE Athens, grouped about its sacred citadel some four miles from the sea, is a typical example of an ancient Greek city, the Piræus is no less typical of a Greek harbour town. It bore the same relation to Athens as Nisæa to Megara, as Nauplia to Argos, and as Lechæum and Cenchreæ to Corinth. But in the case of the Piræus we have the advantage of fuller information not only as to its topography, but also of the manner in which it was adapted to the varying conditions of commerce and of empire. It has therefore an interest of its own, even apart from its association with Athens; and its natural advantages of conformation and geographical



Natural Scale, 1:50,000.

English Miles

0 1/2 1 2 3 4

Kilometres

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Stadia

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

ATHENS AND PIRAEUS showing Walls and Harbours.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

position have again made it one of the principal ports of the Levant, with even more ambitious aspirations for the future.

We have already, in Chapter I., noticed the broader geographical features, especially as they affected Athens; but a more detailed description of the coast line is nec-



HARBOUR OF PHALERUM AND PHALERIC BAY.
Behind, Hymettus.

essary to a comprehension of the Piræus and its historical vicissitudes. The nearest part of the coast to Athens is the broad and open bay of Phalerum, which has a shelving sandy beach such as was very convenient for beaching small ships, according to the early Greek practice. This is, however, open to the south-west, the prevailing

wind; and although this would not matter when ships were high and dry on the land, it must have made embarkation and disembarkation difficult at times. The Phaleric bay is bounded on the east by a rocky headland, Cape Colias, on which the wreckage of the Persian ships was thrown up after the battle of Salamis; on the west by the promontory of the Piræus. The nearest portion of this is a rocky projection, enclosing at its extremity a small harbour, partly natural, partly protected by moles. This is the harbour of Phalerum. At the back of it the ground runs up into a hill which is the highest point of the whole Piraic peninsula, and which must probably be identified as Munychia. To the south-west of this hill a deep bay runs into the shore, forming an almost land-locked basin, the harbour of Munychia. Beyond this the coast sweeps round in a succession of irregular curves, the hill sloping gently to a rocky shore, until it reaches, on the west, the entrance of the great harbour that was, and still is, the chief advantage of the Piræus; this harbour contains a sheet of water nearly fourteen hundred yards by eight hundred, and at its northern and southern ends are inlets which could readily be adapted as separate arsenals and docks. Its entrance is protected on the north by a rocky promontory, known, from the name of a primitive owner, as Eëtionea. Just beyond this is a narrow inlet, known as the *κωφὸς λιμὴν* or "dumb harbour," of no practical use because of its rocky shore; beyond this the coast stretches away, first to the west, then to the north, and then to

the west again, without any natural features that concern us, until we come to the ferry opposite the Cynonura of Salamis, and the straits where the Greeks routed the Persian fleet as it crowded into the narrow channels on each side of Psyttalea.

The open bay of Phalerum was not only the place where the sea was nearest to Athens, but was also, as we have seen, a most convenient place for beaching ships. Accordingly we are not surprised to learn that it was from here that Theseus sailed for Crete to face the Minotaur, and that the Athenian contingent put off to join the Greek fleet on its way to Troy. How long the Athenians remained content with this open sandy bay we cannot tell. The first literary reference to any use being made of the Piraic peninsula is the statement that Hippias, after the assassination of his brother by Harmodius and Aristogiton, had a project of fortifying Munychia and withdrawing there, if he were turned out of Athens. This project, however, was never realised, and it is uncertain whether he ever completed the fortification. But when Athens became a sea power, after the expulsion of the tyrants, the open beach no longer sufficed for her needs. The splendid harbours of the Piræus lay ready to hand, and it is now difficult for us to understand how they were left so long idle. The credit of the change belongs to one man, Themistocles, who was the founder, not only of the Piræus, but of the naval power of Athens. In his archonship, 493 B.C., he

persuaded the Athenians to begin the building of the Piræus, and the construction of harbour works; and when, ten years later, the discovery of a rich vein of silver at Laurium placed a large sum at the disposal of the state, he induced them to devote it to the increase



GENERAL VIEW OF PIRÆUS FROM MUNYCHIA.

Harbour of Munychia (Pashalimani); above, Acte.

of the navy. The result was that Athens, which previously could barely muster fifty ships, furnished two hundred triremes to the fleet which defeated the Persians at Salamis. After this splendid justification of his policy, Themistocles went still farther in his attempt to

make the Athenians turn to the sea for their safety and their power, and even tried to persuade them to desert Athens and build a new city on the Piraic peninsula. Though he was unsuccessful in this attempt, the principle which he advocated was also that of the policy of



GENERAL VIEW OF PIRÆUS FROM MUNYCHIA.

Great harbour of Piræus; above its entrance, Psyttalea; beyond this, Salamis.

Pericles. By means of the Long Walls, Athens and the Piræus were made into a single fortified town, impregnable so long as it retained the command of the sea; and it is from this point of view that the naval and political development of the Piræus must be understood.

The fortifications of the harbour town have already been considered in relation to the defences of Athens; here we are only concerned with them in relation to the topographical problems offered by the Piræus and its harbours.

Even the smaller number of fifty ships that existed before the time of Themistocles must have found the sandy bay of Phalerum in some ways inconvenient, especially with the rival island of Ægina, "the eyesore of the Piræus," so close at hand, and the fleets of Persia at any time ready to make a descent, and destroy the ships drawn up unprotected on the shore. The little Phaleric harbour was the nearest to the bay, which probably continued to be used for purposes of embarkation and commerce; and within the harbour there would be plenty of room for the fifty ships of the early Athenian navy, with the storehouses and arsenal belonging to them; this small harbour would also have the advantage of being protected by the fort on Munychia. It is even possible that the slip-ways for galleys, of which some remains can still be seen in the Phaleric harbour, may date, at least in their original form, from the time before Themistocles.

At the time of the Persian Wars, however, the Piræic peninsula was not yet regarded as the arsenal of a great naval power, the chief centre of the strength of Athens, and the guarantee of the independence of Greece from a foreign conqueror. At the battle of Salamis it was to use the words of the oracle of Bacis, "the strait

between Cynosura on Salamis and the sacred shore of Artemis of the golden sword" that was bridged with ships; and this same sacred shore, *ἱερὸς ἀκτῆς*, is evidently regarded as part of the region sacred to Artemis Munychia. In some other passages, too, Munychia is apparently applied to the whole promontory as its original name, though later the term is restricted to the fort on the hill between the two smaller harbours, and to the district immediately surrounding it.

The steps by which the sacred promontory of Munychia was transformed into the town and arsenal of Piræus cannot be traced in all their succession. The project was that of Themistocles; but we do not know how much of it was realised before his exile. We can only describe the town's formation in its results, not in its progress; it must not be supposed that Themistocles lived to see the ultimate development of the work he had begun.

The town of Piræus enjoyed a distinction, quite apart from its relation to Athens, in the manner in which it was laid out. This was done after the designs of Hippodamus of Miletus, the famous architect who also laid out the city of Rhodes, which is said by Strabo to have resembled the Piræus in character. Some notion of his design can still be gained from the traces of streets and houses and boundary stones, of which several have been found; it consisted of a system of broad, straight streets, crossing one another at right angles, with various spacious squares, devoted to religious or civil use. One of

these, the Agora of Hippodamus, was situated in a central position. The road from Athens led into this square, and from it was another broad road leading to the temple of Artemis Munychia, which was situated on the harbour of the same name. This temple was probably on the site of the old shrine that had given its sanctity to the whole peninsula; and another early shrine may have been the temple of Demeter at Phalerum. The chief temple in the town itself was that of Zeus Soter, with whom was associated Athena Soteira; festivities were held in his honour, with processions through the streets; his altar — a fine work of art by Cephisodotus, who also made the statue of Athena — was decked periodically, and dedications were often made to him or sacrifices offered in his honour by sailors and others. Fine quays and wharves were constructed, with porticoes and market halls. The chief building of this sort was the Deigma, a sort of Exchange where merchants could congregate, show one another samples of their goods, and transact their business, with the help of the bankers who kept their stalls in the same building. This Exchange was on the quay — a position which had the inconvenience of exposing it to a sudden raid.

All these buildings were probably part of the design of Hippodamus, and, as he laid out the city of Rhodes in 408 B.C., it is not easy to assign his work to an earlier date than that of Pericles, to whom some of the porticoes are expressly assigned. He may, indeed, have been one of the Ionians who came at Cimon's invitation; but

this is improbable both politically and chronologically; though Cimon built the Long Walls, we can hardly suppose him to have thrown himself so heartily into the schemes of Themistocles as to devote so much thought and expense to the decoration of the town that statesman had founded. The design of Hippodamus is, on the other hand, most appropriate to Pericles. We have seen how bold were the innovations he proposed on the Acropolis. He could not reconstruct the town of Athens, and substitute broad and even streets for its tortuous and narrow alleys; but he would welcome the opportunity of exhibiting, in the Piræus, an example of a splendid city, such as contrasted with the somewhat mean appearance of the houses and streets of the older town, and would have offered a more harmonious setting to its unrivalled temples and monuments.

So far we have been concerned only with the town of the Piræus; before pursuing its history further, we must turn our attention to the harbours. The old harbour of Phalerum still continued in use, though the galley-slips which it contained, being less commodious and less solidly constructed than those in Munychia, were perhaps reserved for lighter slips; little is left of them now except a portion of the slip-ways. The superstructure was probably made entirely of wood. It is to be noted that the harbour of Phalerum is not included in the three which provided the 372 slips available for docking the ships of the line in the fourth century. It was enclosed within the line of fortification; the wall ran

along the two moles that protected it, ending in a tower on either side of the entrance, which was probably guarded by a chain.

The deeper inlet which ends in the circular basin of the harbour of Munychia was provided with similar fortifications at its entrance. Within it the galley-slips



HARBOUR OF PHALERUM (FANARI).

are, in two or three places, much better preserved. What we now see may be the result of reconstruction or repairs in the fourth century, if not later, but there is no reason to suppose that the arrangements at that time differed from those of the best days of the Athenian empire, and therefore they may appropriately be described here. The slips were bordered at their upper end by a wall which ran, in a polygonal shape, all round the

harbour, or the greater part of it; and outside this wall was a road. The slips themselves sloped down at a gentle gradient from this wall to their lower end, which opened directly on the water. Thus a galley could back directly on to the lower end of its slip-way, and be hauled up clear of the water by means of a windlass. The remains of the blocks on which the keel was supported still remain in some cases, both in Phalerum and in Munychia. Between them, in Munychia, there may be seen also the lower drums of the rows of columns that supported the roof. These are alternately placed with wider or narrower intercolumniations, and carried, according to Professor Dörpfeld's restoration, a roof arranged in a row of gables all round the harbour, so that two triremes were housed under each gable. The slip for each galley measures over 44.¹ m. (= 145 feet) in length by 6.50 m. (= 21 feet) in width; and from these dimensions we can obtain an approximate notion of the size of the ancient trireme. If we allow for the projections at the side to accommodate the rowers, its hull, both in size and proportions, must have resembled that of a modern "destroyer"; like them, it was built almost entirely for speed, and must have been very uncomfortable in a rough or choppy sea.

The great harbour of the Piræus was divided into several parts, of which the names are recorded. Two


¹ The measurement cannot be exactly ascertained, as the lower ends are under water now. I take this estimate from Angelopoulos, *περὶ Πειραιῶς καὶ τῶν λιμένων αὐτοῦ*, p. 67.

of these must be Cantharus¹ and Zea, which are mentioned in the official lists of the distribution of the galley-slips. The order of the different parts of the harbour is described in part by the Scholiast of Aristophanes, *Peace*. 145, who says, "The Piræus has three harbours, all enclosed; one is the harbour of Cantharus . . . in which are the dockyards, then the Aphrodision, and then five stoæ surrounding the harbour." Some of these buildings are subsequent to the time with which we are now concerned; but the position indicated for Cantharus, just within the entrance of the harbour on the south side, and extending about as far as the modern custom-house, is clear enough; and in this region earlier travellers saw the remains of galley-slips, though they have now disappeared. This is, curiously enough, the usual anchorage at the present day for men-of-war, both Greek and foreign. The greater part of the quays facing the south-east side of the harbour, and adjoining the streets of the town, must have been given up to commercial purposes; the Deigma, or Exchange, and other porticoes probably opened on to them. The only place that remains for Zea is the extreme north end of the harbour, near to the present railway station; this is used at present chiefly for small boats, and could easily have been adapted to the purposes of an ancient arsenal.² Here was the chief ship-building yard, and

¹ The view held by some authorities that Cantharus means the whole of the great harbour is untenable if Zea was there also.


² Cf. Wheler, p. 419. (Porto-Lione) "within, it enlargeth it self into a considerable Harbour, with depth enough, and good Anchorage all over; except a little Bay

GALLEY-SLIPS IN HARBOUR OF MUNYCHIA after Dörpfeld.





Walker & Cockereil sc.

PLAN.



LONGITUDINAL SECTION (restored).



TRANSVERSE SECTION
(restored).



storehouses and workshops must have surrounded it, even before the splendid additions that were made to these in the fourth century. Beyond it, on the north-west side of the harbour, was Eëtionæa, with a space too narrow to be of much practical use, though it was essential to the defence of the harbour, and was for this reason of considerable importance.

Such must have been, in the main, the character of the Piræus and its harbours as projected by Themistocles and completed by Pericles, and as it existed during the greater part of the Peloponnesian War. Its extraordinary efficiency as an arsenal and dockyard is sufficiently attested by the record of the various successive fleets sent out by the Athenians during the war. At Salamis Athens had provided a fleet of two hundred ships; to the disastrous Sicilian expedition she sent forth in 415 B.C. 134 triremes, and reinforced them in 413 B.C. by 73 more; yet, in spite of the total loss of these 207 ships, she could still maintain her command of the seas at home; and when the disaster had injured her prestige, she could recover it in a succession of naval actions, and, after a reverse, could make up an emergency fleet of 150 ships to send to the battle of Arginusæ in 406 B.C. The rapidity and efficiency of

at the utmost point of it: which seems to have been formerly a small Harbour for Barques; though now choked up. But that which I judge most considerable is, that the nature of the place is such, that though a Ship should happen to be driven upon the shore, yet it may get off again without damage." It would, in fact, have been a good place for beaching ships, according to the old custom, even before the galley-slips were made.

Athenian ship-building could hardly receive a stronger testimonial. In the fourth century the usual number of the fleet was about four hundred.

The history of the Piræus, from the architectural as well as from the political point of view, is of course closely bound up with that of Athens; but there were certain events that affected the Piræus especially. The first of these was during the rule of the Four Hundred in Athens in 411 B.C. They, or rather the extreme party among them, endeavoured to fortify Eëtionæa, supplementing its external defences by walls also tenable against an attack from the harbour or city. Their object in this was to control the entrance to the harbour, so as to be able either to prevent the return of the democratic Athenian fleet from Samos, or to admit the Spartans. There is no doubt that to have made Eëtionæa into a fort tenable by a small garrison would have been even a more serious menace to the safety of Athens than the fortification of Munychia; but the project never was completed, owing chiefly to the opposition of Theramenes. The fort on Munychia, on the other hand, plays an important part in the history of Athens, and Leake has admirably shown how its possession again and again decided the fate of the city. The most conspicuous example was when Thrasybulus and his band of exiles from Phyle seized it, and made it the basis from which they conducted their successful attack on the Thirty Tyrants, and so began the restoration of Athens after her fall at the close of the Peloponnesian

War. This exploit of Thrasybulus made such an impression on the popular imagination that a miraculous incident is said to have accompanied his night march; his men were said to have been led through the darkness by a pillar of light, and in consequence an altar was established on Munychia to Phosphoros — probably an epithet of Artemis, who had thus shown her favour to those who came to occupy her sacred hill.

The second stage in the restoration of Athenian power, the return of Conon to rebuild the Long Walls after his great naval victory at Cnidus, was also celebrated by a temple dedicated in the Piræus — in this case to Aphrodite Euploia, the sea-goddess of Cnidus, to whose favour he attributed the victory won within sight of her shrine. This temple of Aphrodite at the Piræus was the one situated between Cantharus and the range of porticoes along the quays, — that is to say, just about on the site of the modern custom-house, where it would be a most conspicuous object to all who entered the harbour.

The naval reorganisation of the fourth century brought with it not only extensive repairs and reconstruction of the dockyards and galley-slips, but also, under the administration of Lycurgus, the completion of a building which is perhaps known to us more in detail than any other lost monument of antiquity, and than many that are partially preserved. This is the famous *σκευοθήκη* or arsenal built by Philo, the same architect who later built the great portico of the Hall of the Mysteries at

Eleusis. The specification for this building has been preserved to us in an inscription, which, though obscure in some details, gives a very clear notion of the building as a whole. It was designed to be a storehouse for rigging, and was intended to supersede both a smaller stone building and temporary wooden ones that had been in use before. It was intended only for the rigging belonging to the ships in Zea, the largest of the naval harbours, and was situated near the gateway leading from the Agora, and behind the galley-slips that were covered, like those of Munychia, by a continuous roof. Its length was to be 400 feet, its breadth 55; it was to be built in the main, both walls and columns, of Piraic limestone (*ἀκτίτης λίθος*), but more conspicuous or important parts, such as the lintels and thresholds of the doors, and the capitals of the columns, were to be of Pentelic or Hymettian marble. The roof was of tiles, supported on wooden beams and rafters. The building was to end in gables, and to have windows in its sides, opposite every intercolumniation, and great doorways at the ends, closed by bronze-plated doors. The whole was divided into a nave and two aisles by two rows of columns; and the aisles were to be provided with every convenience for storing ships' gear, such as shelves for cables, and ladders to reach them, and boxes for sails, etc. In the middle was a passage twenty feet broad, between the two rows of columns, separated from the aisles by a partition three feet high. The evident intention was that the building should constantly remain open to public inspection, and

that all storage room should be arranged so that its contents were easily visible from the central nave. Even ventilation is provided for in the specification. The whole building is an admirable example of the detailed way in which work to be done for the state was prescribed, and also of the publicity, in the Athenian democracy, even of matters that are sometimes regarded as state secrets. With such an arsenal there certainly could never be any doubt, either in the mind of a citizen or of an enemy, as to the condition of naval stores.

In the Hellenistic age, there is little to record of the Piræus but successive occupations of the fort of Munychia by different foreign garrisons. The Piræus continued a place of importance until it was vindictively destroyed by Sulla; it recovered very slowly from this disaster, and in Strabo's time was still in a much reduced condition; but the description of Pausanias implies that in his time it had again become a flourishing town. He approached Athens by sea, passing under Sunium with its temple of Athena, and he still saw in the great harbour of Piræus the sheds and slips for the galleys, and the tomb of Themistocles at the entrance. He saw, too, the precinct of Zeus Soter and Athena, with its two bronze statues, Zeus with sceptre and Nike, and Athena with a spear. Here, too, was a portrait group by Arcesilaus, of Leosthenes and his sons; he was the hero of the Lamian War, and, had he not fallen in battle, the Greeks he led might have had more suc-

cess in resisting Macedon. The Long Stoa, one of those facing the quay, and at the northern end, since it was the one included in the fort of Eëtionea by the Four Hundred, was still in the time of Pausanias the chief market near the port; and another which he says was remote from it must be the famous Agora of Hippodamus, the centre of the city laid out by the Milesian architect. Behind the Long Stoa were statues of Zeus and Demos, by Leochares, the latter another of those impersonations of the people of Athens that so many sculptors and painters vied with another in portraying. The most conspicuous building in the harbour was the temple of the Cnidian Aphrodite, dedicated by Conon; and so, appropriately enough, the two names first recalled to the memory of a visitor who came to the Piræus by sea were those of its founder Themistocles, whose tomb was just outside the entrance, and of Conon, who restored its prosperity by his great Cnidian victory, and whose thank-offering to the goddess of Cnidus stood on the right as one sailed into the harbour.

So long as Athens continued to be recognised as the intellectual metropolis of the ancient world, the Piræus must have retained something of its old importance. But in mediæval times it came to be little used. Wheler says: "The Town that was here in former times is now utterly ruined, and deserted, with all the admirable *Porticoes*, and Edifices, *Pausanias* describeth. The only Building that now remaineth is a kind of Warehouse, to receive Merchandises, to gather the Customs

and Taxes; and where the *Veivode*, for the most part, layeth up his *Velania*, to sell to the Merchants." The only survival from classical time was a colossal lion of Greek workmanship, from which the Piræus was named in mediæval times Porto Leone or Porto Drako (monster). This lion was carried off by Morosini to Venice, and now stands there in the arsenal. It bears a peculiar interest for us in the names carved upon it, which have been deciphered as recording a visit to the Piræus by comrades of Harold Hardrada, the same man who fell before our Harold at Stamford Bridge, just before the battle of Hastings.

The new prosperity of the Piræus dates from the establishment of Athens as the capital of independent Greece. Its streets have again been laid out with regularity, set at right angles and with spacious open squares; but the squalid shops and workhouses of a Levantine port are a poor substitute for the splendid porticoes of the old harbour town. It already has become once more the chief port of the Ægean, and is ambitious to play a still more important rôle in the development of the great route between East and West. But in the eyes of many, its chief interest will still lie in the little Greek fishing boats and coasting ships, that still retain much of the character of the ancient vessels unchanged since Theseus sailed from Phalerum with the human tribute for Minos in Crete, and Menestheus put off with his fifty ships to join the Greek fleet on its way to Troy.

NOTE XIV *a*.

THE THREE HARBOURS OF THE PIRÆUS.

A considerable amount of confusion has been caused by ancient references to the three harbours of the Piræus, because modern scholars have, not unnaturally, supposed that the same three harbours are always referred to, especially where, as in the passages quoted at the beginning of Chapter XIV., the later author is evidently referring to the earlier. As a fact, however, the various references to three harbours, those of Thucydides, of Pausanias, and of the Attic official documents, each of them refers to a different set of three, as is obvious enough when one examines the matter.

Thucydides speaks of three natural harbours in the Piraic promontory, before Themistocles took it in hand. These can only be the great (Piraic) harbour on the north-west side and the two smaller inlets (Munychian and Phaleric) on the south-east.

Pausanias points out the superiority of the Piraic harbour in the narrower sense, that is to say the great north-west harbour, because it contained, as organised in later times, three harbours, Cantharus, Zea, and the commercial harbour of Emporion.

The official documents speak of the dry docks for galleys in three naval arsenals, those of Munychia, Zea, and Cantharus.

It appears, then, that the occurrence of the number three in all these accounts is misleading. In reality there are five harbours referred to: those of Phalerum, of Munychia, and of Zea, Cantharus, and Emporion, these last three together constituting the great harbour of Piræus; and the various authorities just quoted happen to select three of these, but a different three in each case, for their special purpose. Pausanias, indeed, guards against error by saying, a little later, that, besides the Piræus, Athens has the harbours of Munychia and Phalerum. Those who are familiar with recent maps or books on the Piræus will notice that I differ from most recent topographers, and have returned, in the main, to the topography of Leake, both as regards the walls and as regards the harbours. In the case of the harbours I am induced to do this mainly by the facts pointed out by M. Angelopoulos in his pamphlet,

Περὶ Πειραιῶς καὶ τῶν λιμένων αὐτοῦ (Athens, 1898). He quotes the numbers of slip-ways for galleys recorded for the different naval harbours, viz. :—

Munychia	82
Zea	196
Cantharus	<u>94</u>
						372

and compares them with the breadth of the slips of which the remains may still be seen, viz. 6.25 m. in Fanari and 6.50 in Pashalimani. It follows from these data that the number of slip-ways recorded for Munychia would require a minimum shore line at the lower end of the docks of 512 m. for the smaller breadth, and of 533 m. for the greater; and similarly the minimum shore line of Zea, for the greater breadth, would be 1274 m. And this, too, allows none of the necessary intervals for quays, etc. Now the available space in Fanari, at the lower end of the slip-ways, is only 440 m.; therefore its now customary identification as the harbour of Munychia must be erroneous; and the available space in Pashalimani, measured in the same manner, is only 900 m.; therefore its identification as Zea must also be wrong. I have verified M. Angelopoulos's measurements on the best available maps, and they appear to me to be correct; nor have they, to my knowledge, been challenged. There is, therefore, no alternative but to return to Leake's identification of Fanari as the harbour of Phalerum, and of Pashalimani, as the harbour of Munychia; and Zea must be placed, like Cantharus, in the great harbour of the Piræus.

The shifting of the harbour of Munychia from Fanari to Pashalimani does not necessarily involve the shifting of Munychia itself; for the position now generally assigned to it lies between the two, and so either might be named after it. The arguments given by Leake for his identification of Munychia as the extreme part of the peninsula are strong; but the discovery of a boundary stone of Munychia to the north-east of the great harbour seems to settle the question.

INDEX

A

Academy, the, 24, 64, 68.
 Acamas, 520.
 Acrocorinth, the, 9.
 Acropolis, the, bombardment of, 506.
 bronzes from, 174-176.
 dismantling of, by Persians, 48, 97.
 rock from, 29-30.
 siege of, by Turks, 355.
 walls of, 36-44, 52-54.
 water supply of, 25-26, 61.
 Acroteria at Epidaurus, 341-342.
 Ægaleos, 10.
 Ægeus, 395, 520.
 Ægina, 2, 3, 14, 135, 312, 548.
 Æschines, 70, 452.
 Æschylus, 99-100, 389, 434, 436.
 tomb of, 523.
 Agatharchus, 407.
 Aglauros, 303, 525.
 precinct of, 134, 525-526.
 sanctuary of, 126, 138.
 Agora, the, 63, 88, 126-128, 381, 455.
 of Hippodamus (Piræus), 550.
 Agoracritus, 396.
 Agoranomion, the, 503.
 Agræ, 91, 120-121, 140, 523, 529.
 Agraulos, grotto of, 47, 54, 97.
 Agrippæum, the so-called, 496.
 Ajax, statue of, 521.
 Akte, limestone from, 30.
 Alabastron, the, 172.
 Alcámenes, statues by, 31, 248, 397-398,
 435, 453, 514, 528, 529.
 Alcibiades, 407, 516.
 in pictures in Propylæa, 241.
 Alcippe, 98, 530.
 Alcmaeonide, the, 45, 96, 187.
 Alexander the Great, 479, 480-481, 521.

Altars of—

Alcmæna, 528.
 Athena, 84, 209, 249.
 Athena Areia, 100, 531.
 Athena and Posidon, 532.
 Hebe, 528.
 Heracles, 528.
 Ilissian Muses, 528.
 Iolaus, 528.
 Pan, 92.
 of Phosphoros (Artemis?), 557.
 Pity (or Mercy), 524.
 Prometheus, 532.
 Zeus Astrapaïos, 96, 144.
 Zeus Herkeios, 77, 251, 363, 365.
 Zeus *Ἰψίστος*, 104, 106.
 Amazons, battles of Greeks and, 98-99,
 282, 349, 388, 392.
 Amphicrates, 242.
 Amphitrite, on Parthenon pediment, 300.
 Perseus' visit to, in painting and pot-
 tery, 392-393.
 Amphoræas, Panathenaic prizes, 170-171.
 Amynos, 115, 140.
 Anacreon, statue of, 250.
 Anakeion, the, 97, 393.
 Andocides, 70.
 Andronicus of Cyrrhus, 488.
 Androustos, Odysseus, 23, 61.
 Angelopoulos, 69 n., 553 n., 562-563.
 Animals, on bronzes, 175.
 on tombs, 473.
 on vases, 159.
 Antæ, of Propylæa, 225, 228, 230, 231.
 of Theseum, 414, 417.
 Antenor, statues of Tyrannicides by, 138,
 203, 521.
 Antigonus, 532.
 Antiochus, 520.
 Antiochus Epiphanes, 486-487.

- Antoninus Pius, 29.
 Aphrodite in Parthenon frieze, 331.
 Aphrodite Pandemos, worship of, 396.
 Aphrodite Urania, cult of, 395-396.
 Apollo in Parthenon frieze, 330.
 Apollo Patrous, worship of, 95-96.
 Apollo, Pythian, cult of, 96.
 Appius Claudius Pulcher, 492.
 Aqueducts, Athenian, 25-29, 108, 139.
 Arcesilaus, 559.
 Arch, triumphal (318 B.C.), 481, 524.
 Archermus of Chios, 185, 199.
 Architecture, early Attic, 177-179.
 Doric, 177-178, 270-281.
 of Erechtheum, 353, 367-370.
 of imperialism, 481.
 Ionic, 177-179, 353, 367-370, 375.
 of Parthenon, 270-281.
 of temple of Nike, 375.
 of Theseum, 411-412.
 Areopagus, 7, 11, 25, 90, 98-100.
 Court of, 100, 386, 387, 505.
 Ares, 98, 99, 530.
 (the god) in Parthenon frieze, 330.
 Argolis, 3.
 Argonauts, the, in paintings, 393.
 Argos, 8, 153.
 Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia, 492.
 Aristi
 Aristion, 492.
 tombstone of, 201.
 Aristocles, 201.
 Aristodemus, 71 n.
 Aristogiton, 45, 128, 137, 138, 203, 242, 473, 545.
 Aristophanes, 43, 69 n., 94, 106, 107, 172, 246, 408, 429, 436, 554.
 Aristotle, 399, 474, 482, 528.
 Arrian, 128, 132.
 Art, athletic school of, 203-207, 289-292.
 Artemis, in Parthenon frieze, 330.
 Artemis Agrotera, 385.
 Artemis Brauronia, precinct of, 55, 84, 226, 246.
 Asclepiadæ, family of the, 431.
 Asclepieum, the, 23, 98, 115, 425-433, 530.
 Asclepius, reliefs dedicated to, 472.
 worship of, 98, 115, 140, 246, 398, 425-433, 473.
 Asia Minor, Ionic architecture in, 367.
 schools of sculpture in, 851.
 Athena, birth of, in sculpture, 304-308.
 contest of, with Posidon, 23, 247-248, 293, 295-304, 358.
 as goddess of healing, 245.
 in Nike frieze, 375.
 in Parthenon frieze, 331.
 statuettes of, 202-203.
 on temple pediment, 186-187.
 on vases of Panathenaic games, 171.
 Athena Hephaestia, 254.
 Athena Promachos, 202.
 Athens, agriculture of, 5-8.
 beginnings of, 88-92, 125-135.
 building materials used in, 29-35.
 bronzes from, 174-176.
 census of, 482.
 climate of, 3-4, 268, 409.
 commerce of, 14-16.
 decorations in, by foreign princes, 482-488, 492-503.
 defences of, 8-14, 506-507.
 drama at, 433-436.
 early sculpture in, 179-186.
 harbours of, 15-16, 542-563.
 influence of Pisistratus in, 185.
 Ionic influence in, 178-179, 185, 383-384.
 medieval, 560-561.
 modern town of, 507, 562.
 occupation of, by Turks, 218, 260-261.
 position of, geographically, 4, 73, 542-545.
 pottery of, 152-174.
 sack of, by Persians, 85, 140, 152, 167, 210, 382.
 school of art in (sixth century), 183.
 siege of, by Sulla, 491-492.
 topography of early, 141-151.
 treasury of, 222.
 walls of, 36, 59-72, 506.
 wards in, 66, 72, 75.
 water supply of, 16-29.
 Attalus I., 483-485, 520.
 Attalus II., 485-486.
 Axiochus, the, 20.

 B
 Bacchylides, poems of, 392.
 Bacia, oracle of, 548.
 Balustrade of Nike temple, 377-380.
 Banquet of a hero, on tombstones, 432, 471-472.

Barathron, the, 65, 66.
 Basilica, derived from "Basileios," 386.
 Bastion, the Nike, 218, 219, 224, 230, 234-235, 374, 376, 397.
 Bates, W. N., 412.
 Bath, the bridal, 18-19, 173.
 Baths, Roman, 504.
 Battle of Gods and Giants, 82, 186-187, 282.
 Bema, the, 106-107.
Birds, Aristophanes', 246.
 Boeotia, 8, 10, 385.
 Bologna, head of Athena Hephaestia at, 255.
 Boreas and Orithyia, 528.
 Breccia, as building material, 31.
 in temple and theatre of Dionysus, 435, 438, 450.
 Brick, baked, use of, in building, 29.
 in walls of Athens, 61.
 British Museum, Athenian relics in, 218, 263, 336, 355, 374, 404.
 Bronze, lioness of (Propylaea), 242.
 sculpture in, 201-202.
 statues in, erected by Attalus I., 483-484.
 statuettes of, 202-203.
 Bronzes from Acropolis excavations, 174-176.
 Brunn, 169 n., 201, 301, 309-310.
 Brygos, 136, 167.
 Buleuterium, the, 126, 131, 134, 137, 390-392, 520.
 Bury, Professor, 237 n.
 Butadæ, the, 362, 365.
 Byzes of Naxos, 270.

C

Cæneus in Theseum frieze, 413, 418, 419.
 Calamis, 243, 519.
 Calenus, 59.
 Callias, portrait of, 521.
 Callicrates, 58, 217, 218, 219, 220, 385.
 Callimachus, Greek general, 389.
 Callimachus, lamp of, 362.
 Callippus, portrait of, 520.
 Callirhoe, the spring, 18-23, 25, 27-28, 120, 141, 143, 149-151, 527.
 Cantharus, 554, 557, 562-563.
 Capitals, of early architecture, 177-179.
 of Erechtheum, 233, 367-368.
 of Propylaea, 232-233.

Carrey, drawings of Parthenon by, 260, 293-304.
 Caryatid Porch, the, 238 n., 355, 356, 360, 370.
 Caryatids of Erechtheum, 355, 369.
 Cassander, 481, 524.
 Cave —
 of Aglauros, 137, 213.
 of Agrauros, 47, 54, 97.
 of Apollo, 92-95, 143, 146, 531.
 with monument of Thrasyllus, 403-404.
 of Pan, 146, 531.
 Cavvadias, 92, 95.
 Cecropium, the, 360-361.
 Cecrops, 520.
 Cellini, Benvenuto, 349.
 Cemeteries, pottery from, 153.
 Centaur on vase, 163.
 Centaurs in sculpture, 282-291, 413, 417-418.
 Cephisodotus, 521, 550.
 Cephissia, 28.
 Cephissus, the, 7, 16-17, 135.
 Ceramicus, the, 63, 136, 153-154.
 tombs in, 457-458.
 vases from, 168.
 "Ceramicus" as used by Pausanias, 515.
 Cercyon in Theseum frieze, 415.
 Chabrias, tomb of, 457.
 Chæronea, battle of, 59.
 Chalcis, 14, 153.
 Charioteer on vase, 168, 207.
 Chariots, in Parthenon frieze, 324-325.
 in Parthenon pediments, 299-300, 312-314.
 Charon depicted on tombs, 472, 476-477.
 Choiseul-Gouffier, Marquis de, 262.
 Chrysippus, 525.
 Chrysostom, Dio, 57 n., 69.
 Church of St. Demetrius Lombardaris, 65, 457.
 Cicero, 461, 492-493, 526.
 Cimon, 52, 56-57, 211, 212-215, 217, 381, 383, 386, 392, 422, 456, 523, 550-551.
 Cistern beneath Erechtheum, 358-359.
 Cisterns in Athens, 25, 98.
 Cithæron, 376.
 Clay, Attic, 63.
 of the Ceramicus, 161-163.
 Cleft of the Persian ascent, 97, 251, 526.

- Cleotas, 249.
 Cleomenes, 79.
 Cleophon, 237 n.
 Clepsydra, the spring, 23-24, 92, 531.
 Clisthenes, 45, 137.
 tomb of, 457.
 Clitias, 164.
 Cnidus, battle of, 59, 557.
 Codrus, 78, 529.
 Codrus inscription, the, 66.
 Coins, statue of Athena on, 214.
 Athena and Posidon on, 248, 298-299.
 Theatre of Dionysus on, 438.
 representing Zeus Polieus, 249.
 Collytos, deme of, 90.
 Colonos Agoraios, the, 422.
 Colonus, 68.
 Colonus Hippius, 532.
 Colour, use of, in statues, 187, 191-192, 195.
 Colours in Theseum, 412-413.
 Columns of —
 Erechtheum, 367-370.
 Parthenon, 273-275.
 Propylæa, 386.
 temple of Olympian Zeus, 487-488.
 Confederacy of Delos, 216.
 Conglomerate, building material, 31, 435, 438, 450.
 Conon, 59.
 tomb of, 457.
 Constantinople, statue of Athena destroyed at, 214.
 Corinth, 8, 14, 15, 396.
 battle of, 458, 465.
 influence of, on Athens, 162 n.
 Coronea, battle of, 252.
 Cossutius, 487, 488.
 Court of Areopagus, 100, 386, 387, 505.
 Cratinus, 21, 395.
 Cresilas, 244, 255, 256.
 Critius, 138 n., 203, 246, 417, 521.
 Curtius, 17, 71, 72, 88, 104, 106, 142, 505 n.
 on identification of Theseum, 424.
 on route of Pausanias, 536.
 on topography of early Athens, 74-75, 89 n., 91, 126.
 Curves in Parthenon, 271-275.
 Cyclopes as wall-builders, 39-40.
 Cyllene, 3.
 Cylon, 44, 79, 103, 161.
 statue of, 252.
 Cylonion, the, 103.
 Cynægeirus, 389.
 Cynosarges, the, 528.
 Cyzicus, 236.
- D
- Dancing-place, an early, 122-123, 433.
 Decelea, 10.
 Deianira on vase, 163.
 Deigma, the (Piræus), 550, 554.
 De Laborde head, the, 320-321.
 Delphi, 152-153.
 Cnidian Treasury at, 354.
 Demeter in Parthenon frieze, 331.
 Demetrius of Phalerum, 461, 481, 482.
 Demosthenes, 173, 452.
 concerning Apollo Patrons of the Athenians, 96.
 on private dwellings in Athens, 406.
 Deucalion, 527.
 Dexileos, monument of, 458, 465-466, 474.
 Diitrephes, 243-244.
 Diogeneion, the, 483.
 Diogenes, 388.
 Dionysium in the Marshes, the, 111-113, 123-124, 141, 142, 143, 148-149, 151.
 Dionysus, birth of, in relief of Theatre of Dionysus, 451.
 on choragic monument, 400.
 dedication of house of Pulytion to, 516.
 on the Kertch vase, 297.
 in Parthenon frieze, 329, 331.
 early precinct of, 111-113.
 state worship of, 452.
 Dioscuri, the, in paintings, 393.
 Dodwell, Henry, 24.
 Doors of Erechtheum, 370-372.
 Dörpfeld, Professor, 17, 81, 116, 122, 247 n., 268, 422, 435 n., 553.
 cited concerning —
 Callirhoe, the spring, 21.
 Dionysium in the Marshes, 111-112.
 plan of Propylæa, 224, 229.
 rebuilding of old temple of Athena, 210 n.
 rivers of Athenian plain, 17.
 route of Pausanias, 537-538.
 Theatre of Dionysus, 444-448.
 topography of early Athens, 142-151.
 treasury on the Acropolis, 80.
 excavations by, 25-27, 108-110.

- Draco, 161.
 Drama in Athens, 138, 433-436, 522.
 Dresden, copies of statue of Athena He-
 phaestia at, 255.
 Dromos, the, 384.
 Duris, 167.
- E
- Echelos, 389.
 Eëtionea, 544, 555, 556, 560.
 Eleusis, 10, 63, 135, 140, 277.
 black limestone from, 35, 231, 372.
 pediments of Parthenon found at,
 293 n.
 smaller Propylaea at, 492-493.
 Eleusinia, the, 121.
 Eleusinium, the, 116.
 Elgin, Lord, 218, 262, 355, 374, 404.
 Elgin Marbles, the, 262-263, 315, 355, 374.
 Emporion, port of, 562-563.
 Endæus, 251.
 Enneacrunus, the fountain, 18-23, 27, 108,
 120, 141, 142, 143, 149-151, 522,
 535-538.
 Enneapylon, the, 42.
 Eos in terra-cotta group above the Stoa
 Basileios, 387.
 Ephebi, the, 483, 525.
 Ephesus, 179.
 Epidaurus, Nereid monument at, 379.
 theatre at, 438.
 . worship of Asclepius imported from,
 398, 425.
 Epimenides, 96, 103.
 Eponymi, the, 392, 520.
 Erechtheum, the, 23, 80, 213, 233, 236-
 239.
 architecture of, 353, 367-370.
 as a church, 354-355.
 doors of, 370-372.
 frieze of, 372.
 influence of, on later work, 353-354.
 marble used in building, 34.
 plan of, 355-363.
 purpose of, 361-363.
 restoration of, 509.
 stone used in frieze of, 35.
 Erechtheus 520.
 house of 76-78.
 Eretria as a burying-place, 475.
 Ergotimus, 164.
 Erichthonius, 303, 349, 366, 525-526.
 birth of, on Theseum pediment, 420,
 Eridanus, the, 12, 16-17, 24, 63.
 Erinnyes, the, 531.
 Errephori, the, 251, 365, 525.
 Erymanthus, 3.
 Etruria, vases found in, 169.
Etymologicum Magnum, the, 21.
 Eubulides, 516, 517 n.
 Euclides, 238.
 Eumenes of Pergamum, 484.
Eumenide, Æschylus', 100.
 Euphranor, 388, 519.
 Euphronios, 136, 167, 168, 392.
 Euripides, 92, 436.
 tomb of, 457, 514-515.
 Eurymedon, battle of, 53, 211, 383.
Euthryphro, Plato's, 386.
- F
- Farwell, J. R., 111.
 Fauvel, 262.
 Females, figures of, in Nike frieze, 378-
 379.
 figures of, in Parthenon pediment,
 268-269.
 Fergusson, James, 268-269.
 Festivals—
 of the Anthesteria, 113, 123.
 of Dionysus, 90, 113, 124, 141, 395,
 399, 452.
 of Dionysus Eleuthereus, 138.
 Iobaccheia, 113.
 Ionic, 95-96.
 of the Lenæa, 111-112, 124, 138.
 Panathenaic, 84, 121.
 of the Synœcia, 73, 89.
 See Games.
 Figures, mourning, 469-470.
 on Parthenon pediment, interpreta-
 tions of, 300-304.
 Findlay, A. F., 505.
 Fire, on the Acropolis (406 B.C.), 238, 371.
 in Opisthodomus (404 B.C.), 238, 257.
 Florence, François vase at, 163-164.
 Food supply in ancient Greece, 5-8.
 Franks in Athens, 60.
 Frazer, J. G., 22 n., 112 n., 210 n., 223 n.,
 513 n., 515 n., 536, 537.
 Fresco-paintings of the Stoa Poikile, 388.
 Frieze of—
 Erechtheum, 367-368, 372.
 Mausoleum, 403.

Frieze of —
 monument of Lysicrates, 400-403.
 monument of Philopappus, 497-498.
 Parthenon, 379.
 stage in Theatre of Dionysus, 453-454.
 temple of Athena Nike, 218, 234, 375-380.
 Theseum, 413-419.
 Friezes, Parthenon, 322-340.
 sculptors of, 340-343.
 Funerals, restrictions on, 460-461.
 Furtwängler, 212, 243 n., 304 n.
 cited concerning —
 copies of the Athena Hephæstia, 255.
 the Erechtheum, 363.
 figures in Parthenon pediments, 301, 309, 331 n.
 lecythus in Propylæa, 244.
 temple of Athena on Acropolis, 80-81.

G

Games, Olympian, 423.
 Panathenaic, 171, 185.
 Gardens, district called the, 528.
 Gardner, Percy, 455 n., 468 n., 470 n., 473.
 Gate —
 Acharnian, 68.
 Beulé, 406.
 of Diochares, 17, 24, 67-68.
 Diomean, 68.
 Dipylon, 17, 49-50, 62-64, 68, 127, 154, 384, 387, 457, 514, 515.
 Itonian, 66, 131, 514.
 Melitan, 65.
 Piræic, 64, 65, 515.
 of Roman Market, 493-495.
 the Sacred, 59, 65.
 Thriasian, 63.
 Gate-house, an early, 55-56.
 Gates, Melitid, 456.
 Germanicus, inscription to, 496.
 Gigantomachy, groups of, 82, 86, 350.
 Gods, and Giants, 350.
 in Parthenon frieze, 329-332, 335.
 Gorgons pursuing Perseus, on vase, 162-163.
 Graves of Mycenaean period, 115.
 Great Mosque, the, 24.
 Gryllus, the name, 241.
 Gryphons, in sculpture of Theatre of Dionysus, 440.

Gryphons, on vases, 159.
 Gymnasium of —
 Hermes, 516.
 Ptolemy, 483, 525.

H

Habron, 59, 70.
 Hadrian, 29, 60, 67, 117, 450, 488, 498-503, 506, 520.
 Arch of, 67.
 Library of, 499, 500, 507.
 Halirrhothius, 98, 99, 530.
 Hall of Mysteries, Eleusis, 481.
 Hand-clasping among Greeks, 466-467.
 Hardrada, Harold, at Piræus, 561.
 Harmodius, 45, 128, 137, 138, 203, 242, 473, 545.
 Harpocraton, 69.
 Harrison, Miss, 247 n., 303.
 Hecatompodon, the, 80, 264, 363.
 Hecatompodos Neos, the, 222, 351-352.
 Hegios, 203.
 Heldreich, Professor von, 245 n.
 Hephæstia, 254.
 Hephæstus, at birth of Athena, 305-308.
 in Parthenon frieze, 331.
 Hera in Parthenon frieze, 330.
 Heracles, in early pediments, 180-183.
 prominence of, in early monuments, 86-87.
 in Theseum frieze, 414-415.
 Heræum of Argos, the, 383.
 Hermæ, the, 516, 518.
 Hermes Street, 388, 516, 517.
 Hermolycus the Pancratiast, 247.
 Herodes Atticus, 35, 60, 146-147, 399, 405, 500, 503-504, 529, 532.
 Odeum of, 30, 60, 98, 131, 484, 500, 503-504, 507, 530.
 Herodotus, 20, 97, 99, 195, 253.
 concerning cleft in wall of Acropolis, 47 n.
 quoted, 208.
 Herondas, 432.
 Herse, 303, 525.
 Hestia, 390, 391.
 in Parthenon frieze, 331.
 Hieron, the potter, 136, 167.
 Hill, of Curses, 100.
 of the Nymphs, 65.
 Hipparchus, 128, 137, 138.

Hippias, 45, 59, 128, 135, 242, 545.
 Hippocrates, the physician, 431.
 Hippodamus of Miletus, 384, 549-551.
 Hippolytus, tomb of, 530.
 Hippothoon, 520.
 Homer, 76-77, 310, 531.
 Horæ, in Parthenon pediment, 310.
 reliefs of the, 200.
 Horologium, the, 488-491, 533.
 Horses, in Parthenon frieze, 199-200, 323-325, 338-339.
 in Parthenon pediment, 321-322.
 on tombstones, 462, 473-474.
 House of, Erechtheus, 76-78.
 Pulytion, 516.
 Houses, Mycenaean, on Acropolis, 76, 79.
 pre-Persian, 114-115, 139.
 private, of fifth and fourth centuries, 406-408.
 rock-cut, 73.
 Huddilston, 167.
 Hydra on early pediment, 180.
 Hymettus, 7, 9, 90.
 marble from, 184.

I

Ictinus, 58, 217, 220, 264, 279.
 Ilissus, the, 12, 16-17, 91.
 bridge across, 68.
 Iobacchi, the, 111, 112.
 Ion, Euripides', 92, 95.
 Ionia, influence of, in Athens, 383-384.
 See Polygnotus.
 Iris in Parthenon pediment, 307, 310.
 Italy, pottery exported from Athens to, 169.

J

Joints in Parthenon, 274-279.
 Justinian, 60.

K

Kará, limestone from, 31, 79.
 stone from, in temple of Dionysus, 122.
 stone from, for water channels, 26.
 Keats, quoted, 311.
 Kertch, gold plaque found at, 349.
 vase found at, 296, 349.
 Key pattern, the, 155.
 King's Portico, the, 386-387.
 Kings, abolition of, in Athens, 44-45.
 of Pergamum, decorations in Athens by, 483-486.

Klein, 167.
 Knights in Parthenon frieze, 323-325, 340.
 Koile, 66, 74, 75, 91.
 Kollytos, 113.
 Κολωνάκι, το, 29.
 Κυδαθηναιον, the deme, 91.

L

Lacedæmonius, 241.
 Lachares, the tyrant, 482.
 Laconia, 8.
 Lamp of Callimachus, the, 362.
 Lantern of Demosthenes, the, 403.
 Lantern of Diogenes, the, 403.
 Lapiths and Centaurs, in sculpture, 282-291, 350.
 in painting, 392.
 in Theseum frieze, 413, 417-418.
 Larissa, the, 9.
 Leæna, 242-243, 473.
 Leake, W. M., 47, 57, 68-69.
 Lecythi, black silhouette figures on, 165.
 funeral, 170, 172, 244, 459, 470, 474-477.
 Lenæum, the, 111-112, 124-125.
 Lenormant statuette, 345.
 Leochares, 519, 560.
 Leon, tombstone of, 473.
 Leos, 520.
 Lesche, fresco-paintings of the, 388.
 Lesser Mysteries. *See* Mysteries.
 Leucippus, daughters of, 393.
 Library, of Capuchin monastery, 403.
 of Hadrian, 499, 500, 507.
 Ptolemy's, 483.
 Light, question of, in temples, 268-270, 412.
 in Parthenon, 337-338.
 Limestone, from Akte, 30.
 black Eleusinian, in Propylæa, 231-232.
 from Kará, 31, 79.
 Piraic, in Odeum of Regilla, 503.
 sculptures in, 182.
 temples built of, 179.
 in Theatre of Dionysus, 438.
 in Theseum, 411.
 Lioness without a tongue, statue of, 242-243.
 Lions of porcelain from tombs, 157.
 Livy, 59, 70, 486.

- Loeschcke, 21.
 Lolling, Dr., 422.
 Long Rocks, the, 92, 96.
 Long Walls. *See under* Walls.
 Lucian, 203-204, 243, 254-255.
 Lusieri, 262, 263.
 Lutrophoros, the, 173-174, 459, 474.
 Lycabettus, 6, 11, 12, 13, 68, 91.
 rock from, 29.
 view of sixth-century Athens from, 134-136.
 Lyceum, the, 24, 399, 528.
 Lycia, wall-building Cyclopes from, 39, 40.
 Lycius, 241, 246.
 Lycurgus, 31, 398, 407, 434, 448.
 portrait of, 521.
 tomb of, 457.
 Lysander, 58-59.
 Lysicrates, choragic monument of, 382, 399-403.
 Lyson, 520.
- M
- Madrid, puteal at, 306, 310.
 Mahan, Captain, 50-51.
 Maidens, in Parthenon frieze, 327, 330.
 statues called, 188, 191-192, 195-200, 201, 204, 207, 356, 370.
 Mantinea, battle of, in painting, 519.
 Marathon, 9, 10, 168, 457.
 battle of, 92, 199, 207, 214, 375-376, 389, 523.
 spoils of, 385.
 Marble, coloured, 31-32.
 Hymettian, 33, 184.
 island, 32-33.
 Parian, 32-33, 82, 269.
 Pentelic, 33-35, 56, 212, 231-232, 503.
 vases in, 174.
 Marriage bath, the, 18-19, 173.
 Mars' Hill, 100.
 Marshes, quarter called the, 112-113.
 Martial, 349.
 Medusa on vase, 163.
 Megara, 8.
 Melite, 87, 90, 113, 422, 424.
 Menander, tomb of, 457, 514.
 Menidi, tombs of, 154, 174.
 Messenia, 8.
 Metal, decorative work in, 174-176.
 Metal work in statue of Athena Parthenos, 349-350.
- Metopes, absence of, from Propylæa, 233-234.
 of Parthenon, 282-292.
 of Theseum, 414-419.
 of treasury at Delphi, 168.
 Metroum, the, 131, 396, 519-520.
 Michaelis, 252 n., 351.
 Micon, 388, 389, 392, 393, 525.
 Middleton, J. G., 29, 31, 32, 370 n.
 Miletus, 14, 153, 179.
 Miltiades, 139, 199-200, 214, 389, 456.
 Mnesicles, 224-231.
 Monument of—
 Hegeso, 464.
 Lysicrates, 382, 399-403.
 Philopappus, 11, 496-498.
 Thrasyllus, 433.
 Monuments, choragic, 399-406.
 funeral, 458-461.
 Morosini, 260-261, 321, 373, 506, 561.
 Müller, O., 417.
 Munychia, fortress of, 59, 71, 135, 544, 549, 556, 559.
 Murray, 156 n., 536.
 Museum Hill, fort on, 59.
 Mycale, battle of, 247, 250.
 Mycalessus, raid on, 243.
 Mycenæ, postern at, 42.
 pottery from, 75-76, 157-158.
 walls of, 39-40.
 Myron, 241, 246, 247, 252, 292, 416.
 Mysteries, at Agræ (the Lesser), 91, 120-121, 140, 523.
 Eleusinian, travesty of, 516.
- N
- Naples, statues in, 203.
 torso of warrior at, 244.
 Naucratis, 179.
 Naupactus, battle of, 247.
 Navy, the Athenian, 51-52, 216, 545-546.
 Naxos, marble from, 32-33, 185-186.
 Ionic capitals carved in marble from, 179.
 Nereids at Epidaurus, 379.
 Nero, visit of, to Athens, 450, 496.
 Nesiotas, 138 n., 203, 246, 417, 521.
 Nessus on vase, 163.
 Nicetas, 214-215.
 Nicias, 234, 236.
 Nike, in Parthenon frieze, 307.

Nike, in Parthenon pediment, 300, 321.
 Nilsson, Dr., 358.
 Nisus of Megara, 528.
 Nointel, Marquis de, 260.
 Nonnus, 19.
 Nymphs, reliefs of the, 200.

O

Observatory at Athens, 11, 64, 65, 66.
 Odeum, the, 394-395, 522, 405.
 of Herodes Atticus, 30, 60, 98, 131, 484, 500, 503-504, 507, 530.
 of Pericles, 492, 529-530.
 of Regilla. *See* Odeum of Herodes Atticus.
 Oedipus, tomb of, 531.
Oedipus at Colonus, the, 532.
 Enoe, 10.
 battle at, 388.
 Eneus, 520.
 Oil, as prize in games, 171.
 traffic in, 494.
 Olive, Athena's sacred, 7, 208, 251, 359, 366.
 Olive groves, Athenian, 16, 128, 135.
 Olive trees, sacred, 170.
 Olympia, 152-153.
 bronzes from, 174.
 sculpture of, 312, 315.
 Olympieum, the, 13, 21, 116-119, 135, 140, 141, 148, 149, 151, 493, 498-499, 514, 526, 527.
 Opisthodomus of Parthenon, the, 222, 238, 352.
 fire in, 238, 257.
 Orchestra, the, 138, 521-522.
 Orchestra (dancing-place), an early, 122-123, 433.
 Orestes, 99, 100, 531.
 Otto of Bavaria, 507.
 Our Lady of the Golden Cave, shrine of, 404.

P

Painted Colonnade, the, 388.
 Painting, possible influence of, in Nike sculpture, 376-377.
 Paintings, in Buleuterion, 520.
 of Butadæ in Erechtheum, 362, 365-366.
 in fresco, 388.

Paintings, referring to Persian Wars, 383.
 in Stoa Basileios, 519.
 in Stoa Eleutherios, 388.
 in temple of the Dioscuri, 393.
 in Theseum, 392.
 Palace Garden, the, 26, 67.
 Pallantids on Theseum frieze, 417-418.
 Panæus, 388, 389.
 Pandion, 520.
 Pandora on basis of statue of Athena Parthenos, 350.
 Pandroseum, the (Erechtheum), 236, 239, 359, 365.
 court of, 251.
 Pandrosos, 303, 525.
 Panops, the fountain, 24, 68.
 Parnes, 10, 376.
 Parnon, 3.
 Paros, marble from, 32-33, 185, 186, 269.
 Ionic capitals in marble from, 179.
 Parthenium, the herb, 245.
 Parthenon, the, 80, 177, 366.
 architects of, 217, 218, 220.
 architecture of, 270-281.
 the bank of Athens, 222-223.
 beginning of, 219.
 as a church, 258-259, 267.
 completion of, 221, 257.
 fires in, 238, 257.
 foundations of limestone, 30.
 friezes of, 199-200, 322-340, 379.
 lighting of, 268-270, 337-338.
 marble used in building, 34.
 as a mosque, 260.
 origin of plan for building, 210.
 pediments of, 293-322.
 restoration of, 510.
 sculpture of, 281-343.
 substructure of, 211, 220-221, 271-272.
 votive offerings in, 249-250.
 Pass of Daphne, 10, 456.
 Pausanias, 16-18, 21-23, 27, 56, 59, 64, 97, 120, 134, 146, 214, 240, 242 n., 243, 247, 252, 284, 293, 295, 301, 304, 314, 344, 350 n., 358, 362, 392, 422, 424, 453, 458, 481, 496, 511-541.
 Payment for sculptures, rate of, 341-342, 372.
Peace, Aristophanes', 408, 554.
 Peace of Nicias, 234, 236, 435.

- Pediments, absence of, from Propylæa,
233-234.
early, 178-183.
of Parthenon, 293-322.
of temple of Athena (old), 82-83.
of Theseum, 419-421.
- Pegasus, 122.
- Pelasgians in early Greece, 39-40.
- Pelagicon (Pelargicon), the, 23, 42-44,
60, 140.
- Peloponnesian War, the, 10, 58, 70, 75, 89,
227, 239, 376, 398, 514.
- Penrose, F. C., 117-118, 178, 271, 273,
385, 421 n.
- Pentelicus, Mount, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 135, 376.
marble from, 33-35, 212.
quarries of, 32.
- Peplous of Athena, the, 333, 365, 531.
- Pericles, 52, 55, 57, 69, 215-218, 223, 226,
236, 351, 373, 381, 395, 551.
portrait of, 255-256.
tomb of, 457.
- Perseus, in pictures in Propylæa, 241.
on vases, 162-163.
- Persians, invasion of Attica by, 45-48.
sack of Athens by, 85, 208-210, 382.
- Phædrus, the archon, 451.
- Phalerum, 16, 23, 51, 57-58, 66.
harbour of, 543, 544, 551-553.
pottery from, 159.
- Phidias, 215, 217, 224, 226, 315, 340, 342-
343, 364.
Athena Parthenos by, 344-351.
first recorded work of, 214.
statues by, 246, 248, 250, 253, 254, 395-
396, 520, 523.
- Phidippides, 92.
- Philip V. of Macedon, 59, 62, 63.
- Philo, the architect, 399, 481, 557.
- Philochorus, 362-363.
- Philopappus, Caius Julius Antiochus, 497.
monument of, 11, 496-498.
- Philostratus, 145-146, 247, 532.
- Phormio, 247.
tomb of, 457.
- Phyle, 64.
- Pictures in hall of Propylæa, 241.
- Pinacothèque, the name, 241 n.
- Pindar, quoted, 170-171, 305.
statue of, 521.
- Piræus, 2, 51, 72, 542-563.
harbours of, 553-555, 562-563.
- Piræus, modern port of, 15.
named Porto Leone, 561.
plan of, by Hippodamus, 384, 549-551.
project for removing Athens to, 215-
216, 383, 547.
- Pisianax, 388.
- Pisistratus, 18, 44, 56, 81, 83, 96, 114, 117,
118, 120, 121, 122, 137-138, 177,
209, 486, 525.
aqueduct built by, 26.
influence of, on art, 185, 191.
- Pit of sacrifice, the, 97, 98, 426.
- Platæa, battle of, 376.
- Plato, 16-17, 24, 69, 386, 396, 477, 482,
528, 529.
geological theorising by, 11-13.
tomb of, 457, 532.
- Plato, comic poet, 457.
- Pliny, 30, 185, 344.
- Plutarch, 56, 106, 258, 350 n.
- Plutus, Aristophanes', 429, 431.
- Pnyx, the, 11, 12, 90, 103-107.
water supply of, 25-26.
- Polemo, 241.
- Poliorectes, Demetrius, 59, 482.
- Polycrates of Samos, 26-27, 139.
- Polygnotus, 241, 377, 384, 388, 392, 393,
524.
- Porcelain, ornaments in, 174-175.
- Poros stone, 30, 179.
sculptures in, 182-184.
- Portico of —
Eumenes, 484.
Hall of Mysteries, Eleusis, 481, 557.
the King, 518.
See Stoa.
- Porticoes —
in the Agora, 386-390.
of Erechtheum, 356.
the Long, 384.
of Propylæa, 225-226, 228.
- Portraits of censors, 483.
- Posidon, contest between Athena and,
23, 247-248, 293, 295-304, 358.
cult of, 363, 365-366.
salt spring of, 23, 77, 359, 366.
- Potters' Quarter, the, 63, 90, 136, 154.
- Pottery, black-figured, 164-166.
from early cemeteries, 153-154.
Mycenæan, 75-76, 154.
Oriental, 159-160, 175.
Phaleric, 159-161, 175.

Pottery, prehistoric, 74.
red-figured, 166-168.

Praxiteles, sculpture on tomb by, 462.
Satyr of, 403, 529.
sons of, 521.
statues by, 515.

Principles of Athenian Architecture, Penrose's, 271.

Procession, of the Mysteries, 63.
Panathenaic, 45, 110, 133, 137, 514.
in Parthenon frieze, 322-336.

Processions, funeral, on vases, 156.

Prodomus, the, 222.

Pronapus, 241.

Propylæa, the, 23, 30, 34, 35, 217, 386.
detailed description, 224-234.
Ionic architecture of, 367.

Propylæa at Eleusis, 492.

Protogenes, 520.

Prytanes, the, 391, 520.

Prytaneum, the, 126, 134, 137, 390, 526.

Ptolemy (Philadelphus?), 482, 483, 520, 525.

Puchstein, Professor, 444-445, 447.

Pyrrhus, the sculptor, 244-245.

Pythium, the, 96 n., 119, 135, 141-148, 149, 527.

Q

Quarries, Naxian, 32-33.
Parian, 32-33.
Pentelic, 33-35, 503.

R

Relief of the Graces (Propylæa), 242.

Reliefs, Neo-Attic, 379.
in Theatre of Dionysus, 449, 450.
on tombs, 463-472.

Repoussé work on antique bowl, 176.

Restoration of buildings, question of, 509-510.

Revett, 261.

Rhamnus, 277.

Rhea, 396.

Rhodes, resemblance of, to Piræus, 549.

Rivers of Athenian plain, 16-17.

Robert, 298.

Rock-cuttings, 74-75.

Rome, emperors of, in Athens, 491-503.

Rome, Middleton's, 29, 32.

Ross, 218, 374, 381, 507-508.

Ruskin, on horses in Parthenon frieze, 339.

S

Sacred Gate. *See under* Gate.

Sacred Way, the, 10, 63, 135, 136, 456, 515.

Saint Paul in Athens, 504-505.

Salamis, 3, 135, 217.
battle of, 207, 375-376, 546, 548.

Salt pool in Erechtheum, 23, 77, 359, 366.

Samos, 179.

Sandstone, Athenian, 30.

Sarcophagi, sculptured, 461.
of Sidon, 354, 470.

Satyr in sculpture of Theatre of Dionysus, 440, 450.

Sauer, Professor, 294-295, 304, 307-308, 410 n., 414, 420-421.

Scamander, marriage bath in, 19.

Schrader, Dr., 181 n.

Scopas, 469.

Sculpture, athletic school of, 203-207, 289-292.
in bronze, 201-202.
of early temples, 179, 182.
of Nike frieze, 376-377.
of Parthenon, 281-343.

Sculptures in poros, 182, 183-184.

Segesta, 277.

Selinus, 423.

Semnæ, shrine of the, 103, 535.

Senate House. *See* Buleuterium.

Shield of Achilles, 157.

Ship, the Panathenaic, 145-146, 531-532.

Sicyon, 153.

Sirens, in tomb reliefs, 473.
on vases, 159.

Σκευοθήκη, the, 557-558.

Σκιάς, the, 391.

Smith, Cecil, 345 n., 350 n.

Snake of Athena, the, 297.

Snakes in tomb reliefs, 473.

Socrates, 57.
disapproval of private splendour of, 407.
relief of the Graces made by, 242.
tomb of, 457.

Solon, 44.
tomb of, 457.

Sophocles, 436, 531.

Spata, tombs of, 154.

Spata, 174.

- Spenser, Edmund, 396.
 Sphinxes in tomb reliefs, 473.
 Spon, 21, 260.
 Spring, a sacred, 425.
 Springs in Athens, 18-25.
 Stadium, the, 35, 121-122, 398-399, 503, 529.
 Stages in Greek theatres, 443-449.
 Statues of—
 Agrippa, 495.
 Aphrodite, 243.
 Aphrodite in the gardens, 397.
 Aphrodite Urania, 395-396, 523.
 Apollo Parnopius, 250.
 Apollo Pythius, 527.
 Ares, 397.
 Athena, 188, 213-215, 223-224, 251, 253, 254, 523.
 Athena Hephæstia, 254.
 Athena Hygieia, 242, 244-246, 516.
 Athena Parthenos, 221, 223, 257, 258, 267, 343-351, 482.
 Athena Promachos, 215.
 Athena and Heracles, 398.
 Athena and Marsyas, 247.
 Cylon, 252.
 Demetrius of Phalerum, 481.
 Demosthenes, 521.
 Diitrephes, 243.
 Dionysus, 397, 404, 435, 453.
 Dionysus Eleuthereus, 122, 454.
 Dionysus Melpomenos, 516.
 Epicharinus, 246.
 Epimenides of Crete, 522.
 Eponymi, 392, 520.
 Erechtheus, 252.
 Erechtheus and Eumolpus, 252.
 Hadrian, 527.
 Hecate, 397.
 Hephæstus, 397, 523.
 Heracles and Cynus, 252.
 Heracles strangling serpents, 247.
 Hermes Agoraios, 524.
 Hermes Propylæa, 242.
 Hermolycus the Pancratiast, 247.
 Hestia, 390.
 Isocrates, 515, 527.
 Knights (on Acropolis), 240-242.
 Læna, 473.
 Lucius Cæsar, 493-494.
 Man carrying a calf, 33, 184.
 Marsyas, 247.
 Statues of—
 Miltiades, 526.
 Mother of the Gods, 396.
 Pegasus of Eleutheræ, 517.
 Perseus, 246.
 Phormio, 247.
 Phrixus sacrificing ram, 247.
 Pindar, 521.
 Procne and Itys, 248-249.
 the Ptolemies, 522.
 Pyrrhus, 522.
 Seleucus, 524.
 Socrates, 515.
 Solon, 524.
 the Sosandra, 243.
 Themistocles, 526.
 Theseus and Minotaur, 247.
 Tolmides, 252.
 Trojan horse, 246.
 Tyrannicides, 128, 131, 137, 138, 203-204, 247, 417, 480, 521.
 Xanthippus, 250.
 Zeus, 527.
 Zeus Eleutherios, 519.
 Zeus Olympus, 372.
 Zeus Polieus, 249.
 Zeus Soter, 387.
 Statues, erected by Attalus I., 483-484.
 in Buleuterium, 520.
 in the Propylæa, 242-244.
 in Stoa Basileios, 518-519.
 in temple of Ares, 521.
 in Theatre of Dionysus, 453.
 Statue, of Athena Parthenos found at Patras, 345.
 the Lenormant, 345.
 the Varvakeion, 345.
 Statuettes, 202-203.
 Stelæ, 113 n., 459, 475.
 Stephani, 298.
 Stoa, of Attalus, 60, 483, 485-486, 507, 518, 525.
 Basileios, 386-387, 422, 505, 518.
 Eleutherios, 387-388.
 of Eumenes, 53, 98, 452.
 the Long, 560.
 Pœcile (Painted Stoa), 388-390, 482, 524.
 Stoics, the, 390, 524.
 Stones of Violence and Ruthlessness, 100, 531.
 Strabo, 17, 24, 144-145, 147, 549, 559.

Strangford shield, the, 345, 350.

Street —

Hermes, 388, 516, 517.

Sophocles, 68.

of the Tripods, 403, 529, 536.

Streets in early Athens, 108-110.

Strongylium, 246.

Stuart, 28, 179 n., 261, 360, 384, 404.

Sulla, 59, 62, 64, 395, 487, 491-492, 514,

529, 559.

Syra, port of, 15.

Syracuse, 153.

T

Tarantinus, 20-21.

Temple, an Ionic, on the Ilissus, 179.

Temple of —

Aphrodite, 528.

Aphrodite Euploia, 557.

Aphrodite Pandemos, 530.

Aphrodite Urania, 395-396.

Apollo Delphinus, 527.

Apollo Patrons, 422, 519.

Ares, 521, 531.

Artemis Agrotera, 384-385, 529.

Artemis Munychia, 550.

Asclepius at Epidaurus, 341.

Athena (early), 29, 76, 77, 78-81, 103,

177, 178, 181 n., 209-210, 223, 235,
363-364.

Athena Nike, 217-218, 224, 225, 226,

234-235, 367, 373-380.

Athena Polias, 356, 362, 364.

Cronos and Rhea, 118, 527.

Delphi, 187.

Demeter, 121, 384-385, 517.

Demeter at Phalerum, 550.

Demeter Chloe, 530.

Demeter, Persephone, and Iacchus,
515.

Dionysus, 435.

Dionysus Eleuthereus, 122-123.

Dionysus in the Marshes, 123-124,

141, 142, 143, 148-149, 151.

Dionysus by the Theatre, 31.

the Dioscuri, 97, 137, 393, 421 n., 525.

Earth, 141, 142.

Erechtheus, 356.

Eucleia, 385, 523.

Hephaestus, 397, 422, 523.

Hera, 503, 513-514.

Heracles in Melite, 86-87, 424.

Temple of —

Ilithyia, 526.

Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome, 487.

the Mother of the Gods, 519.

Nike, 55, 179, 385, 508, 509.

Olympian Zeus, 21, 118-119, 141-148,

423, 486-487, 498-499, 527.

Rome and Augustus, 360, 495.

Sarapis, 526.

Themis, 530.

Triptolemus, 522.

Triptolemus in Agræ (?), 384-385.

Wingless Victory, 58.

Zeus Panhellenius, 503.

See Erechtheum, Parthenon, Theseum.

Temples, on Acropolis, sixth century,
83-85.

in Athens of fifth and fourth centuries,
384-386.

Ionic order of architecture in, 179.

of Piræus, 550.

Terra-cotta, the original, 161-162.

Theagenes of Megara, 26, 139.

Theatre —

of Agrippa, 495-496.

of Dionysus, 26, 30, 98, 123-125, 131,
395, 398-399, 453-454, 484, 507,
526.

acoustic properties of, 438.

date of, 433-436, 447-448.

as place of assembly, 452.

seats in, 438-440.

question of stage in, 443-449.

at Epidaurus, by Polyclitus, 438.

the Great, 98, 382.

Thebes, 153.

Themistocles, 61, 135, 212, 213, 383, 506,
545-549.

plan for building Parthenon attributed
to, 210.

tomb of, 457, 559, 560.

walls built by, 50-52.

Theodorus of Samos, 185.

Theophrastus, 30, 96.

Theseum, the, 6, 127, 382, 392-393, 396-
397, 518.

architecture of, 411-413.

built by Cimon, 525.

history of, 411.

identification of, 421-425.

metopes of, 289-290, 292.

Theseus, 73, 78, 127, 137, 498.

- Theseus, in paintings, 525.
 in Parthenon pediment, 309, 315-317, 320.
 in statues on Acropolis, 252.
 in terra-cotta group above Stoa Basileios, 287.
 in Theseum frieze, 414, 416.
 on vases, 415.
 Thirty Tyrants, the, 59, 106, 556.
 Tholus, the, 126, 134, 137, 390-391, 520.
 Tholus of Polyclitus at Epidaurus, 426.
 Thoricus, tombs at, 154.
 Thrasybulus, 59, 398, 556-557.
 tomb of, 457.
 Thrasyllus, choragic monument of, 403-404, 433.
 Thucydides, 8, 27, 113, 119 n., 216, 256, 382, 456, 527, 532.
 cited concerning —
 the assassination of Hipparchus, 44-45.
 the dress of women, 196.
 the fountain Enneacrunus, 18-19.
 a third Long Wall, 69-70.
 tombstones built into walls, 49, 64.
 topography of early Athens, 88, 91, 126, 141-151.
 walls of Themistocles, 51-52.
θύρωμα, το, 371.
 Thymele, the, 426.
 Timon the Misanthrope, 532.
 Timotheus, 341.
 Tiryns, postern at, 42.
 remains found at, 76.
 walls of, 39-40.
 Tolmides, 252.
 Tomb of Deucalion, 118, 527.
 Tombs, in and around Athens, 67, 456-458.
 reliefs from, 201.
 sculpture on, 462-478.
 statues from, 201.
 vases from, 168-170.
 Tombstones, on Acropolis, 85.
 fifth and fourth century, 459-460.
 sculptured, 154.
 in walls, 49, 64.
 Tourkovouni, 2, 6, 11.
 Tower, Frankish, on Acropolis, 61, 508
 of Timon the Misanthrope, 532.
 at Tiryns, 40.
 of the Winds, 24, 488-491, 533.
 Travertine, 30, 31.
 Treasury, Cnidian, at Delphi, 354.
 Trident mark in Erechtheum, 359, 366.
 Tripods, votive, 399, 404-405, 529.
 Triptolemus, 6.
 Turks in Athens, 60, 218, 260-261.
 Typhon on pediment, 181, 183.
- U
- University, so-called, in Athens, 483.
- V
- Valerian, 60.
 Varro, 491.
 Varvakeion statuette, 345, 347.
 Vase, the François, 163-164, 195.
 the Kertch, 302.
 Vases, birth of Athena on, 305-306.
 black-figured, 162-163.
 burial, 171-172.
 Dipylon, 154-161.
 funeral, 171-172.
 frequency of Heracles on, 87.
 geometrical, 154-155, 157-158.
 in marble, 174.
 for the marriage bath, 19.
 Oriental, 175.
 Phaleric, 159-161.
 of pre-Persian Athens, 136.
 prothesis, 172-174.
 purposes of, 170-174.
 from tombs, 456, 458-459, 474-477.
 Vase-painting, black-figured, 164-166, 173.
 red-figured, 166-168, 173.
 Victory, in hand of Athena Parthenos, 350.
 of Archermus on Delos, 199.
 Victories, flying, 199.
 in Nike frieze, 378-379.
 Vitruvius, 25, 61, 268, 452, 487, 488, 489, 491.
 Votive offerings in Parthenon, 249-250.
 Votive tripods, 529.
- W
- Waldstein, Charles, 281 n., 311.
 Wall —
 Cimonian (of Acropolis), 30, 52-56.
 Hadrian's, 67, 68.
 the Pelasgian, 29, 37, 42-44, 55, 211, 212, 217, 230, 231.

Wall —

supporting, of Parthenon, 211.
of the Pnyx, 105-106.

Walls —

the Long, 36, 46, 56-60, 65-66, 71-72,
215, 219, 383, 514, 547.
of Themistocles, 50-52, 64, 67.

Water-clock in Tower of the Winds, 489.

Water supply, Athenian, 61, 108.

Weber head, the, 320-321.

Wells in Athens, 24, 25, 108.

Wheler, 21, 120, 218, 260, 321, 373,
554 n., 560-561.

Winds, the, in sculpture, 489-490.

Wine-press, an early, 110-111, 140.

Women depicted on tombs, 478.

X

Xanthippus, 250.

Xenophon, 70, 238, 407.

the name, not uncommon, 241 n.

Xerxes, removal of statues by, 128, 138 n.,
203, 480, 521.

Z

Zappeion, the, 504.

Zea, harbour of, 554, 558, 562-563.


Zeno, 390, 482, 524.

Zeus, in Nike frieze, 375.

in Parthenon frieze, 329.

Zeus Eleutherios, 387-388.

Zeus Soter, 387-388.







SEP 22 1936

